

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 482

FL 019 498

TITLE Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education: Volume 1, Numbers 1-4, Spring 1988 - Fall 1990.

INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Foreign Language Studies Center.

REPORT NO ISSN-0898-8471

PUB DATE 90

NOTE 343p.; For individual papers contained in these issues, see FL 019 499-503, FL 019 505-509, FL 019 612-616, and FL 019 654-658.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)

JOURNAL CIT Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education; v1 n1-4 Spr 1988-Fall 1990

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC14 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Bilingualism; *Classroom Communication; English (Second Language); Language Patterns; Phonology; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; *Second Languages; *Writing (Composition)

ABSTRACT

This document consists of the four issues (Spring 1988, Fall 1988, Fall 1989, Fall 1990) of Volume 1 of the serial publication "Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education" (TPFLE). TPFLE is the official journal of the Foreign Language Education Program of the University of Texas at Austin. These four issues contain 6, 8, 5, and 7 papers each, respectively. All TPFLE papers are concerned with various aspects of second language instruction. (LB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mitchell
Elizabeth

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OEI/ERIC position or policy.

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 1

Number 1

Spring 1988

MARGARET ANN KASSEN Native and non-native speaker teacher
response to foreign language learner writing: a study of
intermediate level French

MICHELE MORAGNE e SILVA Is the process of composing in a
second language similar to composing in the first?

MICHAEL BALDZIKOWSKI Second language speech perception: the
flip side of the phonological coin

CLAUDE PROCTOR Jr. Soviet language planning and the linguistic
assimilation of non-Russian ethnic groups in the USSR

ELAINE PHILLIPS Overcoming difficulties in testing oral
competency: a discussion of facilitating factors

DAVID EDWARDS *The Writing Process*

Foreign Language Education Center

The University of Texas at Austin

ED345482

FL019498

**Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education
(TPFLE)**

Editors: George Braine and Lynn Denton

FLEC Journal Committee

John Bordie, Director, FLEC
Elaine Horwitz, Faculty Adviser
Gareth Morgan, Faculty Adviser
Michael Baldzikowski
George Braine
Suresh Canagarajah
Victoria Cobb
Lynn Denton
David Edwards
Lakshmi Gudipati
Elizabeth Mitchell

TPFLE is the official journal of the Foreign Language Education
Center (FLEC) of the University of Texas at Austin.

Publication of TPFLE has been made possible by a grant from the
RGK Foundation of Austin, Texas.

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 1

Number 1

Spring 1988

Articles

- 1 MARGARET ANN KASSEN Native and non-native speaker teacher response to foreign language learner writing: a study of intermediate level French
- 16 MICHELE MORAGNE e SILVA Is the process of composing in a second language similar to composing in the first?
- 26 MICHAEL BALDZIKOWSKI Second language speech perception: the flip side of the phonological coin
- 41 CLAUDE PROCTOR Jr. Soviet language planning and the linguistic assimilation of non-Russian ethnic groups in the USSR
- 55 ELAINE PHILLIPS Overcoming difficulties in testing oral competency: a discussion of facilitating factors

Reviews

- 66 DAVID EDWARDS *The Writing Process*
-

**Foreign Language Education Center
The University of Texas at Austin**

Contributors

MARGARET ANN KASSEN, a doctoral student in Foreign Language Education, teaches French at the University of Texas and at Austin Community College. Her most recent publication was in the Spring 1988 issue of *The Modern Language Journal*.

MICHELE MORAGNE e SILVA is Assistant Professor of English and Director of ESL writing courses at St. Edward's University, Austin. She is a doctoral student in Applied Linguistics.

MICHAEL BALDZIKOWSKI recently completed his MA in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. He has taught EFL in Germany and Poland.

CLAUDE PROCTOR Jr, a doctoral student in Applied Linguistics, has taught Russian at the U.S. Air Force. He is currently employed as a research linguist.

ELAINE PHILLIPS teaches lower-division French at Southwestern University. She is a doctoral student in Foreign Language Education.

DAVID EDWARDS, a masters student in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, is an Assistant Instructor in Technical Writing and ESL at the University of Texas at Austin.

***Native and Non-native Speaker Teacher
Response to Foreign Language Learner
Writing: A Study of Intermediate Level French***

MARGARET ANN KASSEN

Introduction

Although recent emphasis on target language (TL) production in the foreign language (FL) classroom has largely centered on the speaking skill, there is a growing interest in written production as well. This interest has in part been motivated by the intensification of inquiry into the field of composition in the first language (L1) that has occurred in the 1980's. Whether writing is done in the first or second language, all teachers share a common responsibility: to respond to their students' writing. Likewise in both L1 and L2 contexts, it is axiomatic that teachers spend considerable time and effort endeavoring to provide feedback to students about their writing. Yet despite this investment made by teachers, researchers have accumulated relatively small amounts of data demonstrating how teachers actually respond. Certainly, the comments made by teachers could provide a wealth of insights into teachers' attitudes about writing.

Review of Literature in the L1 Context

First language studies that explore actual teacher feedback find that the comments teachers make frequently subvert their original intentions in responding. Although teachers believe that it is important to let writers know if their ideas have been successfully communicated, researchers find that teachers tend to focus on form errors rather than on meaning (Brannon and Knoblauch, 1982; Butler, 1980; Searle and Dillon, 1980; and Sommers, 1982). Instead of helping writers understand how a reader responds to a text, teachers take control, or appropriate, student writing (Brannon and Knoblauch, 1982). Despite considerable research on the process of writing, students are often not given the opportunity to revise their work (Ziv, 1984). Even when revision is included in the curriculum, an error correction focus of marking reinforces a superficial view of revision (Sommers, 1982). Examination of the comments themselves has revealed that they are frequently vague, contradictory, and difficult to interpret (Butler, 1980; Sommers, 1982; and Ziv, 1984).

The work of researchers to describe teacher comments and to examine them in the light of accepted teacher goals has clear pedagogical implications. In addition to their pragmatic function, these findings likewise contribute toward building a theory of responding to student writing (Griffin, 1982).

Review of Literature in the L2 Context

In the second language field, the approaches to investigating teacher responses to learner writing are varied. Three principal areas of investigation identifiable in the literature are: (1) empirical studies designed to test the efficacy of different comment types, (2) analyses of native speaker (NS) and non-native speaker (NNS) reactions to learner production, and (3) investigation of L2 teachers' actual comments on student texts. This first group of studies, those which manipulate feedback types to determine which types of comments are the most beneficial to writing (see Lalande, 1982; Semke, 1984; and Robb, Ross and Shortreed, 1986), do not result in insights into the broad range of possible teacher comments. Thus, the second and third areas of inquiry are more directly applicable in developing a description of teacher response.

The body of research on native speaker reaction to learner language developed out of the assumption that the NS has the competence necessary to judge learner production according to criteria such as comprehensibility and acceptability (see Ludwig, 1982 for a review of this literature). The findings of these studies have implications in guiding selective correction feedback, especially for the benefit of NNS teachers. In a recent study of NS teacher and NNS teacher response to compositions written by German learners of English, Green and Hecht (1985) found that NNS teachers tended to be more severe in their judgments of error gravity than NS teachers, thus supporting earlier findings of James (1980) and Galloway (1980). Green and Hecht also observed that the NS and the NNS teachers rarely viewed the student texts as discourse, which caused the researchers to suggest that language teachers may be too sentence-centered in evaluating L2 written discourse.

The third area of L2 research, focussing on actual teacher responses to writing, is comprised of one study by Zamel (1985). She analyzes the written comments made by English as a Second Language teachers on their students' regularly assigned compositions. After comparing her findings with those of

Sommers, she concluded that there was one major difference between L2 teachers' responses and those of L1 teachers: second language teachers responded as *language* teachers, focusing largely on surface, sentence-level features. Zamel's remaining observations corresponded to Sommers's findings: (1) teachers rarely made content-oriented comments, (2) first drafts were treated as final products, and (3) corrections were inconsistent, vague, or contradictory.

An attempt to describe teacher responding behavior must certainly look at teachers' comments on their own students' papers, as Zamel did. The study should not constrain informants to underline errors as in Green and Hecht, but should rather allow them to respond naturally. Just analyzing written comments, however, is not sufficient. As Butler (1980) says, the meaning behind comments often remains locked inside the teacher's head, so some access is needed to what teachers think as they respond. Furthermore, the comments need to be analyzed according to what the goals of second language composition and feedback are, goals which need to be articulated. Lastly, given the make-up of many university level faculties, the question of possible NS/NNS teacher differences needs to be addressed.

The Present Study

Given the strengths and weaknesses of the previous research, the study reported on here was designed to investigate the comments made by NS teachers and NNS teachers of intermediate French with regards to compositions written by their respective students. The following questions will direct the investigation:

1. What are the concerns expressed by L2 teachers in their reactions to student compositions?
2. Do L2 teachers address similar issues in their comments?
3. Are there any differences between NS teacher and NNS teacher reactions?
4. Do written markings accurately reflect teacher comments?
5. Is teacher feedback consistent with self-expressed goals?

Procedure

Subjects Six teachers of intermediate level French at the University of Texas at Austin participated in this study. The subjects, all females, ranged in age from 23 to 40, and had had from 2 to 15 years of teaching experience each. The three native

speaker subjects also spoke English and had spent at least two years in the United States, while the three non-native subjects had spent one or two years in France. One NS participant was French Canadian but had attended French schools in Canada and had done her *terminale* (last year of secondary school) in France.

Method In one session with the researcher, each informant evaluated a class set of the second regularly scheduled composition of the semester. To encourage the subjects to follow their normal responding procedure, the teachers were asked to mark the first two or three compositions silently. Then, the informants responded to the next three papers aloud, commenting orally as they read and marked the compositions. This think-aloud protocol was audiotaped. After the grade alouds were completed, the teachers continued marking the rest of the class set of papers. To conclude the session, the subjects were asked to rate the comments they had marked on the three think-aloud papers on a scale of seriousness: least, fairly and most serious. Though xerox copies were made of the entire class set of evaluated compositions, this report analyzes data collected only from those compositions graded aloud. The final stage of the study took place several weeks later, when follow-up interviews were conducted by the researcher to inquire into the informants' attitudes towards writing and feedback.

Results Both the written and the oral comments made by the informants on the three think-alouds were transcribed and coded according to subtypes. For the purpose of analysis, the 15 subtypes were subsumed into three major categories: (1) comments referring to sentence level and lower concerns, (2) comments moving beyond the sentence level, and (3) comments involving pedagogical issues. Within the first group, the subjects were found to react to graphemics, morphology, syntax and lexical selection. The second group included responses to context, organization, cohesion, lexical repetition, content and the individual student writer. The last major heading applied to comments about previous instruction, level of instruction, the specific assignment and notions of what the teacher expected of the students.

Table 1 presents the proportion of total comments in each subtype and major category for each informant on all three think alouds. The frequencies indicated here support Green and Hecht's

claim that teachers respond most often to concerns at or below the sentence level. Data from the error seriousness ratings were similarly combined and are displayed in Table 2. Finally, a sampling of responses to two questions from the follow-up interviews is presented in Table 3. In the next section, the findings will be examined in terms of the original research questions.

Discussion

Before interpreting the findings, one aspect of the study needs to be clarified. In preserving the natural teacher-student relationship by having each informant evaluate her own students' writing, it was necessary to sacrifice comparability across subjects. It must be kept in mind that the students' writing abilities directly affected the informants' responses such that one teacher's comments cannot be compared to another's. However, the proportions of the varying types of comments do give us insight into the individual informant's concerns and about possible trends that might merit further investigation.

Concerns expressed in comments. In considering the first question, we must return to the categories delineated in Table 1. It is also worth noting that NS and NNS alike responded to all errors at the sentence level, with very few oversights occurring. Spelling, morphology, and syntax errors prompted the largest proportion of comments for all subjects. In one instance, the instructor focused so intently on correctness of form that a problem in meaning was overlooked. To explain how he would bring his friends gifts if he were rich and famous, a student wrote, "je ne me souviendrais jamais mes amis." [I would never remember my friends.] The teacher commented aloud, "Alors, c'est pas mal. C'est un verbe difficile. Il y a d'ailleurs le de là..." [Well, that's not bad. That's a difficult verb. There is though the preposition *de* missing there.] Semantic concerns were the next most frequent response type. Beyond the sentence level, comments were made less frequently, but all subjects did express some discourse level and pedagogical concerns.

Similarity of concerns. The data provided by the six subjects in this study indicate that these L2 teachers shared common concerns. All of the informants commented on 5 of the 15 subcategories, and at least five commented on 10 of the 15. Some

similarity in responses may have been due to the sampling procedure employed in this study, as all participants taught the same course according to a departmental syllabus under the supervision of one of the informants. Although the composition did occur at the same time in the syllabus for all participants, the individual instructors assigned their own composition topics and were free to mark their students' papers as they wished.

Native vs. non-native speaker reactions. The data in Table 1 do not provide any indication of systematic differences between NS and NNS subjects. While previous research suggests that NS tend to focus more on message than on form, the comments evaluated in this study do not reflect this perspective. Furthermore, error gravity ratings (as seen in Table 2) do not provide conclusive evidence supporting the view that NS are less severe. Two of the three NS studied do tend to be less severe, but the third subject's judgments closely resemble those of the NNS subjects. Speculation about what might have resulted in this lack of clear differentiation leads back to the possibility that the philosophy of the French department employing these teachers and that of the supervisor might have artificially constrained reactions. It is also possible that the informants interpreted the researcher's interest to be one of error correction and that they responded accordingly in their comments. On the other hand, the emphasis that NS respondents placed on form may be a reflection of their own writing training in French schools. Three of the six informants (2 NS and 1 NNS) mentioned this as a possibility.

Comparing written markings to oral comments. The think aloud comments on features at the sentence level and below matched the written markings very closely. Indeed, more feedback at this level was provided on the student texts than on the protocol, as the subjects seemed to instinctively mark all errors very quickly while their spoken comments were slightly more selective. Except for one subject who decided to ask her students to rewrite the composition, all informants used overt correction procedures, providing the students with corrections of spelling, morphology, syntax and vocabulary. While in some cases the correction was self-explanatory, at other times, the simple comment reflected teacher concerns that remained outside the student's grasp. For example, when one subject read, "...j'aurai d'argent..." [I will have {any} money], she added *assez*

[enough],...j'aurai assez d'argent [I will have enough money] instead of adding the partitive construction *de l'* (j'aurai de l'argent [I will have {some} money]) because, according to her oral comment, she wanted to keep the student's structure intact. Another subject, when reading "...je ne travaillerais pas maintenant" [I would not work now.] crossed out *maintenant* [now], thinking aloud that the adverb was inappropriate in that context. These and numerous other examples can be found in the grade alouds, illustrating that the reasons behind markings may be clear to responders yet unclear to the student looking at the simple markings on the page. While in some cases, this problem cannot be resolved even by additional time- and space-consuming comments, it may be desirable for teachers to communicate their goals to students. A comment could be amended to the teacher's composition grading handout, explaining that though there are many ways of expressing a given thought, the teacher will make an effort to correct errors in such a way that the student's chosen structure is preserved whenever possible.

Responding to concerns beyond the sentence level, the informants wrote down fewer comments than they actually made during the think alouds. On the issue of context, two informants wrote comments while five commented orally. Only one subject wrote a comment about content despite the fact that all informants had reacted orally to students' messages. Five of the six participants commented aloud on organization, yet only one provided written feedback on this concern, and her feedback was limited to the number of points awarded for that criterion on her analytical grading scheme. It would appear, thus, that the informants in this study had no difficulty in dealing with their sentence level concerns, but that they were not as successful in communicating their discourse level concerns. This issue will be discussed again in the following section when pedagogical goals are analyzed.

Before continuing to the final research question, let us look at the ratings of error gravity for an additional comparison of written and oral comments. As can be seen by the responses in Table 2, the participants perceived errors as having different levels of seriousness. In spite of this general agreement, only one teacher employed a marking system which reflected discrimination among errors. This subject marked the items she held the students responsible for in red, while errors that were judged beyond the students' level were corrected in green. The other participants

marked all comments in the same way, even though a large percentage of the errors were considered to be of little importance. While the grade feedback (X, -1, -2, etc.) written in the margins by some responders might be considered an effort to communicate the importance of certain errors to students, these markings were often ambiguous. According to data collected in the think alouds, the same grade marking was used to indicate a single error as well as a cluster of errors. Sometimes the grade indicator was placed between two lines of writing such that the student could not know which line contained the error(s) to which the teacher was reacting.

Comments in relation to goals In the follow-up interview, each informant was asked questions about writing pedagogy. When questioned about the role of composition in the L2 context, the subjects unanimously responded that composition gave the students the opportunity to use vocabulary and grammatical structures that had been studied in class. The strong concordance of opinion on this issue helps to explain why the informants' attention was so focussed on sentence level concerns.

The second most frequently mentioned role of composition was that it allowed the students to express personal ideas. Indeed, several informants claimed that the aspect of composition that they appreciated most was that it allowed them to get to know their students better. Here, an inconsistency is apparent: the teachers wanted their students to express themselves and claimed to attend to students' messages, yet they rarely gave students any indication of attention to content in their comments.

A number of the informants indicated that concerns such as organization and content were more relevant at more advanced stages of language instruction. This view helps to explain why the responders did not write comments on these higher level concerns on the student texts.

When asked about why they gave feedback on composition, the respondents were in less agreement and were less confident about their answers. The most frequent response, offered by three of the informants, was that feedback built up students' confidence, helping them realize that they could write in French. Some participants wrote words of encouragement like *Bon* [Good] or *Mieux* [Better] at the top or end of student texts. However, in discussing feedback to L1 writers, Sommers questions the value of vague, rubber stamp comments such as these. The grading

scheme of two subjects was constructed so that students received credit for communication as well as accuracy, a procedure which was designed to communicate to students the instructor's concern for content. Several informants indicated that the students would be encouraged simply by the grades themselves, because the writing grades were slightly higher than those on daily quizzes and tests. Overall, grades were viewed as a strong motivating factor by these informants because the vast majority of their students were taking French to fill a university requirement. Until additional investigations are conducted into student attitudes (such as those by Semke and Cardelle and Corno), we will not be able to make definitive statements about whether the teachers are indeed achieving their affective goals by the means they described.

Another value of feedback verbalized by informants was that it made students aware of where their problems were. Occasionally, the teachers made general comments about particular strengths and/or weaknesses, but on the whole, only overt feedback was employed. One subject took notes on the most common errors, intending to discuss them in class. On the whole, comprehensive error correction was used, a technique which though identifying errors, does not serve a clear remedial function. Despite the subjects' belief in the importance of making students aware of their inaccurate TL hypotheses, they were rather pessimistic in their estimations of the percentage of students who would actually look over the comments if no rewrites were required. They reported that perhaps only one student out of a class of 20 would voluntarily consult the teacher regarding comments made on the composition. In fact, one informant was so convinced of the ineffectiveness of feedback that she claimed to provide comments largely out of a sense of professional conscience. Given such discrepancies between goals and perceived effectiveness, researchers certainly need to do more to address the issues involved.

Conclusions and Implications

This examination of teacher comments provides insight into what the major concerns of L2 teachers are. The cases studied here suggest that teacher response is fairly uniform. Sentence level concerns were the clear focus of both oral and written comments. Attention to context, content, organization and other such concerns beyond the sentence level was less frequent and less likely to be mentioned in written comments that appeared on

the student texts. It must be remembered that the scope of this study was very restricted (6 instructors of French at one university). As a result, no claims for generalizability to other language instructors in other contexts are made, yet these findings regarding the concern for form over content support earlier conclusions of research in the L1 context (Searle and Dillon) and in the L2 context (Green and Hecht, Zamel).

Although it may seem self-evident, it appears that we as teachers need to be reminded that students see only the marks on the page. Evidence from this study as well as from previous investigations suggests that the markings themselves are often vague, difficult to interpret and ambiguous. The markings may also fail to present a true picture of how serious the teacher judges the error to be. While it may not be possible to resolve all these problems given the limitations on teachers' time, an increased awareness of these issues may help us become more sensitive to our students needs and more communicative of our own expectations.

The importance of pedagogical goals is also highlighted by this study. While the goal of attending to surface level issues is consistent with marking practices, one word of caution bears repeating regarding this dominant focus on form: teachers may unintentionally be communicating a narrow, restricted view of writing and language use to their students. While linguistic accuracy receives a high priority from FL practitioners, concerns such as cohesion, content, organization, etc. must also be represented to language learners through written comments.

Whether teachers' comments promote their goal of encouraging students to express themselves is less certain. When few or no personal comments are written on student papers, it is unlikely that students will be aware of the teacher's interest. Dialog journals and other types of free writing may be more appropriate for fulfilling this goal than formal composition.

Even more importantly, the notion that discourse concerns are somehow better suited for advanced levels of instruction needs to be questioned. This belief seems to imply that language learning progresses from an emphasis on form in the early stages to a focus on higher level concerns in the later stages. This view is clearly not supported in the literature on language use in general (Grice, 1975; and Steinmann, 1982), nor in Krashen's theory of second language acquisition (Krashen, 1982), nor in the recent work on the process of writing (Flower and Hayes, 1981).

Recent publications about L2 pedagogy also refute this notion. Taylor (1981) states that since most L2 students never achieve native speaker proficiency, teachers "cannot justify indefinitely postponing a pedagogical emphasis on content in favor of form." Dvorak (1986), after examining second language acquisition theory and first language writing research, concludes that teachers should respond to content, organization, clarity and coherence, while limiting error correction to those places where straightforward rules apply. This study only analyzed comments at the intermediate level of instruction; future investigations should examine feedback and goals at different levels to determine how sentence level and suprasentential concerns are articulated throughout the FL curriculum.

Although this study was unable to identify separate trends for NS and NNS teachers, the question regarding differences between the two groups is still not resolved. This researcher plans to modify the experimental design in a follow-up study such that informants will also respond to a common composition, thus allowing comparisons to be made across subjects. Future inquiry should also consider the teaching context (effects of departments/supervisors) and attitudes toward written language in relation to educational background.

What emerges from the cases examined here is the need for an increased awareness on our part as teachers about our goals and expectations of learners writing in the second language, the appropriateness of these goals based on L2 research, and how we communicate our goals through feedback on student papers. Additional research is needed to examine student affective reaction to feedback and to determine effective types of feedback. Differences among teachers should be studied to determine which factors (such as NS/NNS, educational background, etc.) influence our responses. By pursuing this topic from a number of perspectives, we will come closer to being able to articulate a theory of responding to FL student writing.

REFERENCES

- Brannon, L., & Knoblauch, C. H. (1982). On students' rights to their own texts: A model of teacher response. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 157-166.
- Butler, J. F. (1980). Remedial writers: The teacher's job as corrector of papers. *College Composition and Communication*, 31, 270-277.

- Cardelle, M., & Corno, L. (1981). Effects on second language learning of variations in written feedback on homework assignments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 251-261.
- Dvorak, T. (1986). Writing in the foreign language. In B. H. Wing (Ed.), *Listening, Reading, Writing: Analysis and Application* (pp. 145-163). Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Galloway, V. (1980). Perceptions of the communicative efforts of American students of Spanish. *Modern Language Journal*, 64, 428-433.
- Green, P. S., & Hecht, K. (1985). Native and non-native evaluation of learners' errors in written discourse. *System*, 13, 77-97.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics Vol. 3. Speech acts*. New York: Seminar Press.
- Griffin, C. W. (1982). Theory of responding to student writing: The state of the art. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 296-301.
- James, C. (1977). Judgements of error gravity. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 31, 116-124.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition error: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Ludwig, J. (1982). Native-speaker judgments of second-language learners' efforts at communication: A review. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 274-283.
- Robb, T, Ross, S. and Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 229-255.
- Searle, D., & Dillon, D. (1980). The message of marking: Teacher written responses to student writing at intermediate grade levels. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 14, 233-42.
- Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 195-202.
- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 148-156.

- Steinmann, M. (1982). Responding to student writing. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *What Writers Know: The Language process, and Structure of Written Discourse* (pp. 291-323). New York: Academic Press.
- Taylor, B. P. (1981). Content and written form: A two-way street. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 5-13.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19 79-101.
- Ziv, N. D. (1984). The effect of teacher comments on the writing of four college freshmen. In R. Beach, & L. Bridwell (Eds.), *New Directions in Composition Research* (pp. 362-380). New York: The Guilford Press.

TABLE 1
Percentage of total comments by types for each subject

Subject	Sentence level and lower		Beyond sentence level		Pedagogical concerns	
NS 1	grammar	79.5	context	1.5	previous instruction	
	vocabulary	12.9	content	1.5	and assignment	2.3
			cohesion	.8	level	.8
			organization	.8	follow-up	0
			repetition	0	ideal text	0
			individual	0		
	TOTAL	92.4	TOTAL	4.5	TOTAL	3.1
NS 2	grammar	61.9	context	0	previous instruction	
	vocabulary	19.4	content	1.0	and assignment	5.2
			cohesion	1.0	level	0
			organization	1.0	follow-up	0
			repetition	4.1	ideal text	0
			individual	6.2		
	TOTAL	81.4	TOTAL	13.4	TOTAL	5.2
NS 3	grammar	60.6	context	1.1	previous instruction	
	vocabulary	19.1	content	3.2	and assignment	8.5
			cohesion	0	level	1.1
			organization	0	follow-up	0
			repetition	3.2	ideal text	0
			individual	3.2		
	TOTAL	79.8	TOTAL	10.6	TOTAL	9.6

NNS 1	grammar	51.7	context	1.1	previous instruction	
	vocabulary	14.3	content	3.3	and assignment	3.3
			cohesion	3.3	level	2.2
			organization	2.2	follow-up	4.4
			repetition	0	ideal text	1.1
			individual	13.2		
	TOTAL	65.9	TOTAL	23.1	TOTAL	11.0
NNS 2	grammar	60.7	context	2.8	previous instruction	
	vocabulary	9.4	content	3.7	and assignment	12.2
			cohesion	1.9	level	2.8
			organization	.9	follow-up	0
			repetition	.9	ideal text	0
			individual	4.7		
	TOTAL	70.1	TOTAL	15.0	TOTAL	15.0
NNS 3	grammar	50.5	context	.9	previous instruction	
	vocabulary	19.3	content	4.6	and assignment	10.1
			cohesion	0	level	2.8
			organization	3.7	follow-up	2.8
			repetition	0	ideal text	1.9
			individual	3.7		
	TOTAL	69.7	TOTAL	12.8	TOTAL	16.5

TABLE 2
Judgements of error gravity by percentage per subject

Native Speaker	least*	fairly	very	NN Speakers	least	fairly	very
NS 1	75.5	18.4	6.1	NNS 1	34	32	34
NS 2	30.2	31.7	38.1	NNS 2	40	45	15
NS 3	62.2	23.6	13.9	NNS 3	40.5	40.5	19

* This category includes those errors classed as not at all serious by NS1, NS2, NS3 and NNS2.

TABLE 3
Interview results on two questions

Question 1: What do you perceive is the role of composition in the second language classroom?						
Responses	Subjects					
	NS1	NS2	NS3	NNS1	NNS2	NNS3
A. to provide learners with the opportunity to use previously studied grammar structures, vocabulary items	x	x	x	x	x	x
B. to provide learners with the opportunity to express their own ideas	x	x		x	x	x
C. to reinforce oral language skills		x	x			
D. to help learners organize their thoughts			x			
E. to provide learners with the opportunity to use extended discourse					x	
Question 2: What value is there in providing feedback?						
Responses	Subjects					
	NS1	NS2	NS3	NNS1	NNS2	NNS3
A. to encourage students	x	x	x		x	
B. to orient learners to expression in French		x		x	x	
C. to help students identify basic problems						x
D. to call learners attention errors					x	
E. to fulfill professional obligation	x					

Is the Process of Composing in a Second Language Similar to Composing in the First?

MICHELE MORAGNE e SILVA

First language (L1) composing processes have been investigated considerably in the last fifteen years. Application of this research has been influential in restructuring writing classes and texts, as well as in reevaluating assumptions of good writers' behavior. Perhaps as an outcome of this renewed interest in how and what good writers compose, schools and universities have placed increasing emphasis on fundamental writing ability on writing exams.

More than 343,000 foreign students currently study in American universities (N.E.A, 1987). Additionally, a large number of immigrant and refugee students help to make a significant percentage of students for whom English is not their native or first language. These students must also demonstrate proficiency in writing in English and usually enroll in at least one composition course specifically designed to help second language (L2) students improve their writing in English. Unfortunately, a large body of L2 composing process research does not yet exist and many ESL composition courses and texts have been designed with little attention given to theoretical issues unique to L2 composers. As Krashen notes, "while reasonable suggestions have been made on the basis of first language research, empirical investigation is lacking" (1984: 38).

Empirical studies in second language composing are not lacking; most of them, however, are unpublished and many are still in progress. One of the most important issues these studies attempt to investigate is if and how writing in a second language is the same as writing in the first. This overview of relevant literature in first and second language composing processes attempts to answer this research question: Is the process of composing in a second language similar to composing in a first language?

Research in First Language Composing

Research in the nature of the composing process has been extensive since Emig's influential "composing aloud" study of eight twelfth graders in 1971. Emig found that composing was a

non-linear process characterized by frequent attempts to discover meaning. Later work by Perl (1980) and Sommers (1980) confirmed the recursive process of writing, showing that writers move backwards in order to move forward in their writing. Often this is done to regain a "felt sense" of their intended meaning and even to discover new meaning.

The work of Flower and Hayes (1981) introduced a theory and model of the cognitive processes involved in writing based on "thinking-aloud" protocol analysis. Four major points of their theory show that writing is made up of a set of distinctive thinking processes; these processes have a hierarchical, embedded organization; composing is a goal-oriented thinking process; and, writers create these goals by generating new goals or changing previous goals based on what they have learned through writing. The Flower and Hayes model of composing processes presents composing as made up of three major components, including the task itself, the writer's long term memory (LTM) and specific cognitive composing processes. In addition, a Monitor is used in moving from one component area to another. The task includes the rhetorical problem and the text produced so far; LTM includes the writer's knowledge of such things as topic, audience and writing plans; and the important composing processes include planning, translating and reviewing. Within planning are the subprocesses of generating, organizing and goal setting. Likewise, reviewing includes the subprocesses of evaluating and revising.

Although Flower and Hayes' model of composing has attained wide acceptance and recognition, there have been numerous attempts by other researchers to create new models of composing. One such attempt has been presented by de Beaugrande (1984). His parallel stage interaction model represents composing as a complex but not chaotic process including multiple internal/affective variables and external/environmental variables. His model allows constant interaction among various levels of skills involved in composing. The continuum of skills moves from the lowest level of coordinating sounds and letters, to using phrases, developing concepts, and eventually to the highest level of representing goals.

Although most research on the writing process deals with metacomponents or cognitive processes involved in writing such as planning and strategy use, processes involved in performance have also been explored. Scardamalia, Bereiter and Goelman

(1982) have examined performance components which are used in actual production, incorporating a writer's psychological system and affecting the writer's use of his/her knowledge base. Scardamalia et al. note that production factors such as speed of memory searches, short term memory (STM) limitations, and the demands for attention on STM can affect cognitive processes in writing. Significantly, a writer's ability to "find" the right information at the right time and to remember high-level goals and intentions may be dependent solely on production factors.

Bracewell (1982) feels that it is often not a lack of skills that produces poor writing but an inability or unawareness of using existing skills in new ways. This is especially true for children learning to write who are also moving from oral to written modes. Bracewell feels that metacognition is important in applying tacit knowledge of communication strategies in a deliberate manner, such as is required in composing.

Much of the earlier work in composing processes examined the writing behavior of skilled vs. unskilled writers. Most researchers have concluded that unskilled writers tend more to low-level linguistic concerns at the expense of high-level conceptual matters. Pianko (1979) observed that remedial writers hesitated often when concerned about spelling, and as opposed to traditional freshman writers, they only infrequently scanned their writing to evaluate produced texts and direct future evolving text. Perl (1979) studied unskilled writers and found that a great majority of revisions or changes in their writing were linguistic and not content related. Although she described their composing behavior as recursive and deeply embedded, the unskilled writers' concern over editing often interrupted this process.

Research in Second Language Composing

Research in English as a second language (ESL) writing is quite limited and has dealt almost exclusively with written and pedagogical considerations. The preoccupation with written product in the ESL field may reflect the traditional assumption that L2 writing is speech written down (Buckingham, 1979) and that, at least in early stages of instruction, writing is a valuable method for testing and correcting L2 acquisition.

The work of Robert B. Kaplan (1966, 1967, 1976) and others in the field of Contrastive Rhetoric has developed through the analysis of L1 and L2 written products. Briefly, Kaplan posited that languages and cultures hold patterns of rhetorical organization

which may be specific to that language group or culture. English expository prose was analyzed as developing in a linear pattern with few digressions allowed from the central thesis. Romance, Oriental and Semitic languages, however, developed in different manners, each allowing certain types of digressions from the central point.

Although Kaplan's central notion has remained the same, his recent work in the area takes into account current composing process research:

first, writing is a process and the teaching of writing needs to deal with the process in all of its complexity, and not merely with the product. . second, individuals from differing linguistic systems come to the writing process not only with differential control of the language and of the writing conventions but also with vastly differing presuppositions about both the process and the product (147).

Research in Contrastive Rhetoric from a product and process perspective has been presented and debated at the last seven TESOL conventions. An entire issue of the *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* (1982) has been devoted to this subject as well as numerous dissertation studies. Despite continued work in the area, however, conclusive results have not been obtained. Techniques for measuring rhetorical pattern differences are not adequate and differ widely across studies, making comparisons difficult. Perhaps intensive work in L1 and L2 composing processes may reveal new insight in rhetorical structure and other macrostructure concerns in L2 writing.

There exists a large body of literature discussing pedagogical consideration of ESL writing. Most of these in the past have stressed either controlled or free composition with little attention given to theory. This has been criticized by researchers (Taylor, 1981; Raimes, 1983; McKay, 1984). Indeed, as Zamel (1976, 1982), Raimes (1983) and Krashen (1984) note, very little process-oriented research of ESL composers has taken place. Zamel's 1982 and 1983 studies are pioneering investigations in this area.

In her 1983 study of six advanced ESL students, Zamel found many similarities between L1 and L2 composers. However, her research objectives were specifically directed toward finding similarities between ESL and native English speaking writers. Zamel did not indicate in her findings if differences also existed.

Through observations Zamel made of the students while composing and through informal discussions with the students,

she felt that the writers "understood that composing involves the constant interplay of thinking, writing and rewriting" and that their writing consistently appeared recursive and generative (1983:172). Pre-planning in the form of notes or lists was important for the writers. While composing, frequent pauses occurred to review generated text against intended meaning. Most revision work of the skilled writers was global, and they paid attention to meaning and intent while reserving surface level revisions for the end of the process. The least skilled writer, though, attended to smaller problems of changing words or phrases earlier during the process.

These observations were similar to Perl's (1980) L1 findings that good writers were more concerned with meaning while poor writers were often preoccupied with surface concerns. Zamel's skilled students did not appear overly concerned with linguistic problems. They used strategies to overcome difficulties in lexicon and syntax and used dictionaries toward the end to correct their errors. The least skilled writer did not possess these strategies.

Although Zamel's study helps bridge the gap between L1 and L2 composing process research, care should be taken in generalizing her findings to all ESL writers. First, Zamel's subjects were quite advanced and it is possible that the characteristic composing processes of her skilled writers were directly related to their level of acquisition of English. Since the subjects' level in English was not assessed, it is difficult to know if her one unskilled writer lacked fundamental skills in English that the other writers might have possessed. Secondly, since the subjects' L1 writing ability was not evaluated, it is likewise difficult to determine if writing skill in the L1 was important in indicating L2 writing skill.

Recent work by Raimes (1985a, 1985b) shows some patterns in ESL writing processes, but according to Raimes, no clear profile of a skilled or unskilled ESL writer has emerged. Common behavior by the subjects in her two studies include extensive rehearsing and limited editing, findings differing greatly from Zamel's L2 studies and Perl's L1 study. In one study with two levels of ESL subjects, higher level students wrote more frequently, revised more and rehearsed more frequently than lower-level students. However, even lower-level writers edited less and weren't concerned with small revisions as much as in Perl's study. Interestingly, a wide range of language proficiency scores in English did not correspond to major differences in writing quality. Since Raimes also has not looked at L1

composing of her subjects, it is unknown if L2 writing skills and quality correspond to writing skills in the L1.

The Relationship Between First Language and Second Language Composing

One published study has looked at the interaction of L1 and L2 in composing with child subjects. Edelsky (1982) looked at first, second and third graders in a bilingual program stressing writing. In her study she found that all aspects of the writing process were applied in writing in the L2.

what a young writer knows about writing in the first language forms the basis of new hypotheses rather than interferes with writing in another language. . . . [this] can mean anything from tacit to explicit knowledge of local conventions, . . . to knowledge that written texts have different requirements than oral ones, to knowledge of what processes and strategies are used during writing. Application of such knowledge can appear as either surface similarities or differences when one compares texts in two languages written by the same child (227).

Edelsky concluded that several factors played important roles in the application of the writing processes, strategies, and higher level knowledge in writing in the second language: the two writing systems, the children's literacy experiences, their level of L2 proficiency, sociolinguistic constraints, and the writing process itself. To this we might add Bracewell's (1982) discussion on metacognition in applying oral communication skills to a written context. Similarly, Widdowson (1983) has noted that L2 writers need to apply their knowledge of the L1 discourse process to the new L2 context through linguistic rules of English. This can be especially difficult if L2 writers do not come from literate societies or are not familiar with the medium through which we write in English (1985).

Finally, a few studies, recently completed or still in progress, are looking at aspects of the writing process in the L1 and L2 of adult subjects. Friedlander (1988) examined the effects of the L1 on the L2 composing of twenty-nine native Chinese speaking adults. Findings indicate that his subjects planned more and wrote better when planning was kept in the language of acquisition of knowledge for a specific task, whether or not that language was actually used in writing the final essay product. However, interrupting this planning process by switching into another language negatively affected the essay. This can be explained

through the limited capacity of STM which is used in translating as well as retrieving topical knowledge.

Another important aspect of composing, revision, is being examined by Gaskill (1985). His study is analyzing revision of native Spanish speakers writing in both Spanish and English. One preliminary finding concurs with Raimes (1985) in that low-level ESL writers do not make extensive superficial revisions as native unskilled English writers seem to do. However, Gaskill's data reveal that few macrostructures or organizational changes are made by any of his subjects. This may be due to the difficulty of keeping so much in mind while revising. Preliminary findings from Cook (1985) indicate that subjects who are better writers in their L1 also write better in their L2, regardless of subjects' similar TOEFL scores. My own case study of one adult composer writing on a variety of written tasks shows that overall composing processes and high-level goal creation transfer well from the first to second language. Preliminary findings also indicate that familiarity and practice of the writing experience - both content and form - in a specific language have a positive effect on this subject's ability to establish and attain goals in writing tasks of that language (Moragne e Silva, 1986).

Is the process of composing in a second language similar to composing in the first language? Given the current data in L1 and L2 composing processes, this cannot be answered with any certainty. As Raimes has recognized (1985a), a single profile of an L2 composer has not yet been identified. Similarly, a specific L2 composing process has not been revealed. However, certain characteristics are emerging which may or may not be confirmed through subsequent studies. In general, studies of child and adult composers show a high transfer of composing skills from the L1 into L2 composing. Apparently, many skilled L1 writers become skilled L2 writers despite less linguistic proficiency in the L2.

It is clear, however, that research in the composing process of native English speakers writing in English is not always generalizable to non-native English writers. What is not yet clear is if differences between native and non-native writers can be attributed to additional variables of writing in a second language, or if composing processes and characteristics of skilled writers actually differ across languages and cultures. Despite similarities that do exist between writing in a first and second language, writing in a second language increases the complexity of the first language writing process. It is this increased complexity in second

language composing that deserves additional attention of researchers.

REFERENCES

- de Beaugrande, R. (1984). *Text production : Toward a science of composition*. Norwood, NJ : Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Bracewell, R. (1980). Writing as a cognitive activity. *Visible Language*, 14, 400-422.
- Buckingham, T..(1979). The goals of advanced composition instruction. *TESOL Quarterly* , 16, 211-28.
- Cook, M. (1985). The relation of first and second language writing : A study of essays written in Spanish and English by Hispanic foreign graduate students. Paper presented at the 19th Annual TESOL Convention, NYC, April, 1985.
- Edelsky, C.. (1982). Writing in a bilingual program: The relation of L1 and L2 texts. *TESOL Quarterly* ,16, 211-28.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, Il : National Council of Teachers of English.
- Flower, L. & J. R. Hayes. (1981). A cognitive theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication* , 32, 365-87.
- Friedlander, A.. (1988). First-language effects on second-language composing : Aid or hindrance? Paper presented at the 39th Annual Convention-CCCC, St. Louis, Missouri, March, 1988.
- Gaskill, W. (1985). Composing in Spanish and English:Focus on Revision. Paper presented at the 19th Annual TESOL Convention, NYC, April, 1985.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning* , 16, 1-20.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1967). Contrastive rhetoric and the teaching of composition. *TESOL Quarterly* ,1, 10-16.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1976). A further note on contrastive rhetoric. *Communication Quarterly* , 24, 12-19.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1982). An introduction to the study of written texts : The " discourse compact ". In Robert B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 3.
- Krashen, S. (1984). *Writing : Research, theory and applications*. Oxford : Pergamon.

24/ *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*

- McKay, S. (1984). *Composing in a second language*. Rowley, MA : Newbury House.
- Moragne e Silva, M. (1986). First and second language composing processes : A case study. Paper presented at the 20th Annual TESOL Convention, Anaheim, CA, March, 1986.
- National Education Association. (1987). *The 1987 NEA almanac of higher education*. Washington, D.C: N.E.A.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composition processes of unskilled college writers. *Research in the teaching of English* , 13 , 317-36
- Perl, S. (1980). Understanding composing. *College Composition and Communication* , 31, 363-69.
- Pianko, S. (1979). A description of the composing processes of college freshman writers. *Research in the teaching of English*, 13, 5-22.
- Raimes, A. (1976). Composition : Controlled by the teacher, free for the student. In J. Fanselow & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '76*. Wash. D.C: TESOL.
- Raimes, A. (1983). Anguish as a second language? Remedies for composition teachers. In A. Freedman, I. Pringle & J. Yalden (Eds.), *Learning to write : First language/second language*. New York : Longman.
- Raimes, A. (1985a). An investigation of how ESL students write. Paper presented at the 19th Annual TESOL Convention, NYC, April, 1985.
- Raimes, A. (1985b). What unskilled ESL students do as they write : A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly* , 19, 229-58.
- Scardamalia, M., C. Bereiter & H. Goelman. (1982), The role of production factors in writing ability. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *What writers know: The language, process, and structure of written discourse*. New York: Academic.
- Sommers, N. (1980), Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication* , 31, 378-88.
- Taylor, B. P. (1976), Teaching composition to low-level ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly* , 10, 309-19.
- Taylor, B.P. (1981). Content and written form: A two-way street. *TESOL Quarterly* , 15, 5-13.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1983). New starts and different kinds of failure. In A. Freedman, I. Pringle & J. Yalden (Eds.), *Learning to write : First language/second language*. New York Longman.

Composing in First and Second Language /25

- Widdowson, H. G. (1985). Key questions about writing : A round table discussion. Colloquium at the 19th Annual TESOL Convention, NYC, April, 1985.
- Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom : What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly* , 10, 67-76.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing : The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly* , 16, 195-209.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students : Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly* , 17, 165-87.

Second Language Speech Perception: the flip side of the phonological coin

MICHAEL BALDZIKOWSKI

In the study of the sound system of language, phonology, the bulk of theory and research has revolved around language output, the product of language. In a linguistics chronology, speech perception research is at best at an adolescent stage. In much the same way, theory and research on phonological acquisition has taken the same route, beginning by concentrating on speech that has been produced by infants and developing children. Only in the last decade and a half has the study of infant speech perception really developed. It is little wonder then that in the field of second language acquisition, schooled in linguistics and a grade behind language acquisition, researchers have concentrated on language output and little research has been devoted to the topic of second language speech perception.

In this paper, speech perception research will be reviewed and organized around issues relevant to second language acquisition. Issues to be discussed include the concept of a critical period for speech perception as well as the effects of linguistic training and/or linguistic experience on speech perception. Speech perception in bilinguals, the relationship between speech perception and production, and perception of accent will also be discussed to provide additional insight into second language speech perception. Finally, conclusions concerning the role of speech perception in second language acquisition will be drawn and suggestions for further research will be offered.

When referring to speech perception throughout this paper, I will mean phonetic/phonological segmental perception. The role of supra segmentals in speech perception will not be addressed. In addition, the terms "perceive" and "process" will be used interchangeably.

Theories of Speech Perception

Theories of speech perception have generally followed two lines of thought; those that support a special speech processor and those which posit one auditory processor for both speech and nonspeech. Recently, theories positing dual or multi-level processors have been developed.

Those theories that posit a special speech processor include the so called "motor theory" (eg. Liberman et al., 1967), the theory known as "analysis by synthesis" (Stevens & Halle, 1967), and theories which posit special feature detectors in the process of speech perception (eg. Abbs & Sussman, 1971).

Schouten (1980), however, claims that speech is perceived in the same way as non-speech, on a purely auditory level. He reviews evidence that questions the idea of a special speech processor and concludes that, although such a special speech mode may exist, there appears to be insufficient evidence for such a claim.

Finally, there are also theories which posit a multiple processor for speech, (eg. Werker & Logan, 1985). These theories claim that the speech signal is first processed acoustically and then phonetically. The auditory level is where the acoustic information is transformed into a neurally encoded phonetic signal. At the phonetic level, the acoustic signal is transformed into different phonetic values. The phonetic units are then converted into phonological values before the higher level processing (eg. semantic) takes place.

All these theories have been developed as a result of first language speech perception research. It is unclear then where second language speech perception fits in. Is speech perception language specific? Is there a different perceptual process and/or system for a second language or is the first language the perceptual base for the second language? In fact, concepts of speech perception that are concerned with second language learning appear to be based on one of the models discussed above for first language speech perception.

Infant Speech Perception and a Critical Period

Much of the research concerning infant speech perception has taken place in the last fifteen years. The pioneering study of infant speech perception is that of Eimas et al. (1971). The results of his experiments, in which he tested discrimination of consonants along a voice-onset time (VOT)¹ continuum, indicated that infants (1-4 mos.) perceived voicing qualities and that they perceived them categorically.² This implied that speech perception may be operating

¹ VOT is the time between closure of the stop (e.g., [p b]) and the beginning of voicing. VOT quality has been isolated for a number of languages (Abrahamson and Lisker, 1970) and is often used as a feature to study speech perception.

² Categorical perception is another phenomenon used in the study of speech perception. Simply described, it is when a range of sounds are perceived as

at a very early age, perhaps even from birth. Much research has been done on infant speech perception since this first study. (See Jusczyk, 1981 for a review.)

Though the concept of an innate special speech processor is not the focus of the present discussion, evidence accumulated while investigating infant speech perception has raised a question relevant to the area of second language speech perception. That is, is there a critical period for speech perception in general and second language speech perception by implication?

In an experiment with infants from a Spanish-speaking environment which investigated their ability to discriminate along a voicing continuum, researchers found the VOT boundaries to be quite similar to that of the Eimas et al. infants even though the boundaries for the same VOT continuum would be quite different for the adults of each language group (Lasky et al., 1975). This evidence indicated that infants could perceive phonetic contrasts not native to their own environment. Another experiment contrasted the perceptual abilities of infants and adults from an English-speaking environment to discriminate sounds from Czech (Trehub, 1976). These results indicated that infants could discriminate foreign speech sounds much better than adults. This raised the question of whether there was some biological boundary for speech perception as has been posited for speech production (eg. Lenneberg, 1967).

In an experiment that tested a number of language capabilities including discrimination, Snow and Hoefnagel-Hohle (1978) found that adolescents were better than young children at discrimination tasks and that adults were the next best. In fact, children had the worst scores. Their findings were consistent with the results of an earlier experiment (Politzer & Weiss, 1969), which found that older children outperformed younger children on perceptual tasks.

More recently, in the first of a set of experiments by Werker and her colleagues (1981), a number of interesting findings regarding a critical period for the perception of speech have been reported. Using a discrimination task involving Hindi dental/retroflex contrasts, it was found that 6 month old Canadian children with no background in Hindi were able to discriminate between these contrasts in much the same way as Hindi-speaking adults. They repeated this experiment with four year old English-speaking

belonging to specific phonemic categories rather than along a continuum from one sound to another.

children and found that they were incapable of discriminating the same contrasts (Werker & Tees, 1983). In yet another experiment, they found that although 8-10 mos. old infants were able to discriminate between the sounds, infants just 2 mos. older had the same poor results as four year olds. Retesting those same 8-10 month old children two months later, they found that these infants had lost the ability to discern the contrasts (Werker and Tees, 1984). Another researcher (Burnham, 1986) has posited two critical periods for the *loss* of speech perception capabilities. The first period is consistent with the evidence from Werker et al. at 6-12 mos. He suggests that loss of speech perception capabilities during this period occurs due to lack of exposure to relevant phonetic stimuli. The second period he posits to be between the ages of four and eight and suggests that the loss this time is due to lack of phonetic experience. He suggests that the results of loss during the first period might be extremely difficult to reverse while those capabilities lost during the second period would be, in comparison, much easier to reacquire.

Thus, it could be posited there is a critical period for speech perception and it might be best to posit this as a critical period for loss of perception. However if, as both Werker et al. and Burnham suggest, the boundary for this critical period exists at around 8 mos., this concept would appear to have little impact on second language acquisition for obvious reasons. First, infants at this stage cannot accurately be said to be acquiring a second language. Even in a bilingual environment, the process of acquisition would appear, at that time, to be more closely related to (dual) first language acquisition rather than second language acquisition. Further evidence for questioning the utility of positing such a critical period for speech perception is the apparent capability of children and adults beyond this stage to process a second language. So, although such a critical period might indeed exist, its effects appear to be reversible later and thus its impact on second language acquisition would be minimal.

Linguistic Experience and Speech Perception

However, this loss of sensitivity to nonnative sounds raises the question of how linguistic experience might affect speech perception. As this loss of sensitivity does not appear to be due to neural decline (Werker & Tees, 1984), it may be due to native linguistic experience. In an experiment with Kikuyu children (Streeter, 1976), in which they were tested for discrimination along

a VOT continuum, results showed both the ability to discriminate qualities that they were not exposed to as well as some qualities of voicing that they had experienced in their native environment. In contrast to those theories that support the idea of an innate speech processor, Simen and Fourcin (1978), in a cross language study of speech pattern learning, concluded that categorical labeling of speech sounds is not innate but rather learned and to some extent, language specific. Werker (1984), in one of her many experiments concluded that this loss of perceptual ability discussed above was, in fact, due to linguistic experience.

This role of linguistic experience in speech perception appears to suggest that speech perception might be language specific. Studying the development of speech perception in growing children, Zlatin and Koeingsknecht (1975), found evidence that there may be developmentally related age differences in perception of the voicing contrasts. They found that as the subjects got older, they narrowed their perceptual boundaries. Flege and Eefting (1986) found evidence that indicated that auditory processing might change with age. They found that Spanish- and English-speaking children and adults perceive different VOT values for their respective languages concluding that adults were narrower in their perception due to more linguistic experience in the native language. From a second language perspective, Flege (1985) theorizes that not only is perception language specific, but that second language learners map out second language sounds through their own first language phonetic "chart". Scholes (1968) had claimed earlier that categorization of English vowels by non-natives is also based on their native language categorizations. Even earlier, Sapon and Carroll (1958), claimed that there was a significant difference in perception based on native language. This is supported by a more recent study from which the researcher concluded that second language learner perception is fundamentally different than native speaker perception (Gass, 1984).

Further evidence of a language specific perceptual speech mechanism comes from studies of adult learners, which show their failure to discriminate sounds that are not in their native language. In an oft-cited study by Miyawaki et. al., (1972), English and Japanese subjects were asked to discriminate between /r/ and /l/. It was found that Japanese learners, for whom this contrast was not native, had a poor ability of discrimination. In a similar study (Mackain, Best & Strange, 1981), evidence also indicated that experience had a positive effect on discrimination. In this experiment, those Japanese

subjects who had had English at school when they were younger were able to distinguish the /r/-/l/ contrast significantly better than those who had not. Flege (1984) also found that Arab subjects who had had more English experience outperformed those who had had very little in a VOT discrimination task. In a more recent study involving multilingual subjects (Werker, 1986), results indicated that not only does experience aid discrimination but that this experience must be specific. In other words, simply a broader base of phonetic perceptual experience will not aid discrimination of a phonetic contrast not in the realm of this experience.

From this evidence, it would appear that speech perception develops according to the linguistic environment of the subject, and might be language specific. This theory raises two new issues that must be considered: Can first language speech perception be modified to incorporate a second language? Do bilinguals and second language learners have two separate systems of perception, one for each language?

Bilinguals and Speech Perception

Caramazza et al., (1973) tested French-English bilinguals in Canada for stop consonant perception and production. His findings indicated that although the subjects seemed to have two systems of production, they had a single perceptual system intermediate to monolingual speakers of both languages. Further tests on Hebrew-English bilinguals (Albert & Obler, 1978) and Icelandic-English bilinguals (Garnes, 1977) produced similar results.

These findings combined with evidence reviewed earlier might suggest that language learners process the second language through the perceptual system of the first language, modifying and adding to an already existing system rather than creating a new one. It could follow then that bilinguals, both early and late, do much the same thing, the former developing with one system for both languages while the latter would just adjust the first system to accommodate the second language.

It should be noted that in the studies cited above, although bilinguals seemed to have a unitary system for perception, the perceptual system of the bilingual was different from the systems of monolingual native speakers of both languages.

Linguistic Training and Speech Perception

The second issue raised by the theory that speech perception develops specific to the language environment of the individual, is

whether the developed system can be modified by linguistic training. In 1966, Henning claimed that training could aid not only the teaching of pronunciation, but also the discrimination of sounds. However, Strange and Dittman (1984) studying the effects of discrimination training on the perception of /r/-/l/ by Japanese adults learning English concluded that modification of the first language perceptual system is slow and effortful and that training had little effect. This supported their earlier conclusions after an experiment which attempted to train English speakers to discriminate a three-way contrast in Thai (Strange & Jenkins, 1978). Their conclusion was modified somewhat by Tees and Werker (1984), who concluded that although subjects could be extensively trained to discriminate these contrasts, training had little long term effect; i.e., the perceptual system could be modified temporarily, but there was a "use it or lose it" process which took place.

Jamieson and Morosan (1986), using a different technique than Strange and Dittman, studied the effects of training on the perception of the /ð/-/θ/ contrast in English on Francophones. They concluded that adult perception of non-native speech sounds improved with training and that perception has a higher degree of plasticity than performance.

In an earlier study than the one cited above, Werker and Tees (1981) concluded that training could help adult discrimination along the VOT continuum. Similarly, Streeter and Landauer (1976) attributed some of the ability of Kikuyu learners to discriminate along the VOT continuum to the training they received.

In two recent studies, (Pisoni et al., 1982; McClaskey et al., 1983), in which subjects were trained to perceive a 3-way stop contrast, researchers found evidence that perceptual mechanisms used by adults can be modified by simple techniques. They concluded that discrimination training facilitates the ability to discriminate and that the adult speech processing system has a higher degree of plasticity than previously thought.

From this evidence, it appears that training can have an effect on speech perception abilities leading to incorporation of second language phonetic contrasts. However, differing results for the various experiments suggest that technique may play a fundamental role. There is also some evidence, however, that the modifications will not remain if the training stops and that extensive training is needed to effectively "change" the existing perception system of the learner.

Perception vs. Production

Related to the question of how both linguistic training and experience affect speech perception, is the issue of how modification of the perceptual system relates to the production system of the learner.

Regarding this issue, there again is little empirical evidence on the relationship between perception and production. Proponents of the motor theory would posit that there is a dependance of one of these systems on the other: that speech perception is dependant on speech production.

However, according to evidence from studies of bilinguals, also cited above, there appears to be a certain independence of perception in relation to production.

On the issue of order of acquisition, one study and its replication, which investigated the perception of the /r/-/l/contrast in English by Japanese adults (Goto, 1971; Sheldon & Strange, 1982) produced evidence that production can in fact precede perception in adults. Results showed that although some of the subjects could produce the contrasts accurately, they could not discriminate them even in their own productions.

On the other hand, studies with children provide evidence that perception precedes production. Edwards (1974) found that perception generally precedes production even though order of perception and order of production may not be identical. Williams' study (1979) of bilingual Spanish-English children also found that there was a shift in the production of words which accompanied the children's shift in perception.

This difference in order of perception and production between children and adults may be due to the earlier development of speech perception in children. Whereas adults would have fully developed speech perception and production systems, the child would have to use what it had available. If the system of speech perception began to develop in prelinguistic children, it would seem logical for speech perception abilities to precede production abilities.

There appears to be a large gap in the research between the young child and the adult. In order to learn more about the relationship of production and perception, more research is needed on subjects between these two maturational extremes.

Perception of Accent

To summarize our discussion so far it appears that speech perception develops, at least to some extent, specific to the native

language environment of the individual. Although the individual's perceptual system appears to be modifiable through linguistic experience and training, this modification may have as its base the phonetic representations for the sounds of the first language. Some additional support for these assertions comes from studies of perception of accent.

Let us assume for the sake of our discussion that accent does occur and is perceived by native speakers. Although a complete discussion of how accent is perceived is beyond the scope of this paper, what is perceived as accent may be assumed to be those elements not included in the phonological/phonetic inventory of the native language. This supports the idea that speech perception may be language specific in so far as these unfamiliar elements would be perceived either as acoustic noise or as something foreign or strange. If second language learners can perceive accent in other samples of non-native speech, then we might have evidence that speech perception is modifiable. That is, that the L2 learners have added these once strange or foreign elements to their perceptual repertoire so that sounds not familiar to the L2 now are the cause of the perception of an accent.

Flege (1985) has indeed hypothesized that these detailed phonetic representations of the sounds in the native language enable the listener to detect accent in non-native speech. That is, that the lack of correspondence between that which is perceived and those phonetic representations, cause the listeners to hear something unfamiliar and foreign, i.e., an accent. In one of four experiments he performed, Flege also found evidence that detection of accent by a native speaker was not dependant on any experience in the speaker's native language. Further, he found that native speakers could detect accent in short phrases, CVsyllables, phonetic segments and even bits of phonetic segments. If native speakers detect accent and they are able to do so with such minute bits of linguistic information, would second language learners be able to detect accent in other non-native speech in the same way and to the same extent?

Gass (1984) tested adult ESL learners and native English speakers on their abilities to discriminate along a VOT continuum from /b/ to /p/. She found that perception of the VOT qualities of the first language was fundamentally different than the VOT qualities of the second language. In fact, she found that the VOT qualities for the L2 were perceived continually while these qualities in the first language are perceived categorically. She also found evidence that perception of the L2 was influenced by both first language and target

language VOT qualities. Two further experiments (Sheldon & Strange, 1982; Goto, 1971) in which Japanese ESL learners and native English speakers were tested on their ability to discriminate /r-/l/ found that native speakers were better at perceiving accent than non-natives. These studies suggest that the first language speech perceptual apparatus does indeed affect second language speech perception. One consequence of this is that second language learners do not detect foreign accent in the target language as accurately as native speakers.

Scovel (1981) also investigated this aspect of perception and found again that non-native speakers could indeed detect accent but that they were not as good as native speakers. Interestingly, he tested three ability levels of second language learners and found that as the language ability of the learner increased so did their ability to detect accent in non-native speech. Recently collected data by this author produced evidence that learners with a higher proficiency level in the second language were more accurate at detecting accent in non-native speech (Baldzikowski, 1988). This evidence supports the idea that the perceptual system can be modified in the direction of the second language and that experience and training do indeed produce just such an effect.³

Summary

Although the literature relevant to second language speech perception is recent and somewhat sparse, that which we have reviewed enables us to make some interesting observations.

From the evidence it appears that there is a critical period for speech perception at about the age of 8-10 months. After that, speech perception develops as a function of the specific language environment of the individual.

This language specific perceptual system appears to be sensitive to modification either through linguistic experience or linguistic training. There is also some evidence suggesting that greater second language proficiency and accurate speech perception are related.

There also appears to be evidence that the systems of speech production and perception interact but it is not clear how and in what way. In bilinguals, evidence suggests that although there may be two systems for speech production, one for each language, there is

³ It should be noted that the above discussion is concerned with the phonetic aspects of accent rather than the social or psychological perception of accent.

only one intermediate level of speech perception. This may be the case for second language learners as well, i.e., second language learners simply modify and adjust their speech perception apparatus to account for new linguistic characteristics rather than developing an entirely new perceptual system.

Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

All of this evidence suggests that speech perception might play a significant role in second language acquisition. It appears that speech perception is not only related to speech production but to overall language proficiency even though the extent and direction of these relations have yet to be determined. There is also ample evidence that speech perception is modifiable, both through training and experience. It might be then that in the process of acquiring a second language, speech perception plays the initiating role upon which all other language factors such as production and comprehension are based. Yet, even if such speculation appears to stretch the evidence reviewed here, suggesting that speech perception at least facilitates the acquisition of a second language does not appear to lack support.

However, research in speech perception, which can be related to second language acquisition, is sparse and there are many gaps that need to be filled in.

To address the differences in the development of speech perception from infancy to adulthood, speech perception research investigating children and adolescents is needed. Such research would also help answer questions concerning age-related perceptual flexibility.

Any and all research concerning how the perceptual system of the individual is modified to account for new speech characteristics would be invaluable for the field of second language acquisition. Techniques which facilitate this modification need to be developed and tested. Tracking these modifications in second language learners over time would help illustrate the role of speech perception in second language acquisition. Studying non-native perception of accent may be one way of doing this.

The relationship between perception and production also needs to be investigated to address the issue of whether there are perceptual bases for production difficulties in second language learners and vice versa. Is there a sensitive period in the relationship between perception and production of speech? Is there a perceptual basis for accent?

Upto now, researchers have paid little attention to speech perception in the study of second language acquisition. Although second language speech has been used to study speech perception, this is not true in reverse. Yet, evidence indicates that speech perception might play a role in second language acquisition. For this reason alone, second language speech perception merits further research.

REFERENCES

- Abbs, J. & Sussman, H. (1971). Neurophysical feature detectors and speech perception: A discussion of theoretical implications. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 14, 23-36.
- Abramson, A. & Lisker, L. (1970). Discriminability along the voicing continuum: Cross-language tests. In *Proceedings from the Sixth International Congress of Phonetic Science*. Prague: Academia, 569-573.
- Albert, M. & Obler, L. (1978). *The Bilingual Brain..* New York: Academic Press.
- Baldzikowski, M. (1988). Non-native perception of non-native accent. Unpublished Masters Thesis. University of Texas at Austin.
- Burnham, D. (1986). Developmental loss of speech perception: Exposure to and experience with a first language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 7, 207-240.
- Caramazza, A., Yeni-Komishian, G. Zurif, E. & Carbone, E. (1973). The acquisition of a new phonological contrast: The case of stop consonants in French-English bilinguals. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 54, 421-428.
- Edwards, M. (1974). Perception and production in child phonology: The testing of four hypotheses. *Journal of Child Language*, 1, 205-219.
- Eimas, P., Siqueland, E., Jusczyk, P., & Vigorito, J. (1971). Speech perception in infants. *Science*, 171, 303-306.
- Fllege, J. (1984). The effects of linguistic experience on Arabs' perception of the English /s/ vs. /z/ contrast. *Folia Linguistica*, 18, 117-138.
- Fllege, J. (1985). The detection of French accent by American listeners. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 76, 692-707.
- Fllege, J. & Eefting, W. (1986). Linguistic and developmental effects on the production and perception of stop

- consonants. *Phonetica*, 43, 155-171.
- Garnes, S. (1977). Effects of bilingualism on perception. In O. Garnica (Ed) *Papers on Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics*. Columbus, OH: Department of Linguistics, Ohio State University.
- Gass, S. (1984). Development of speech perception and speech production abilities in adult second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 5, 51-74.
- Goto, H. (1971). Auditory perception by normal Japanese adults of the sounds "L" and "R". *Neuropsychologia*, 9, 317-323.
- Henning, W. (1966). Discrimination training and self-evaluation in the teaching of pronunciation. *IRAL*, 4, 7-17.
- Jamieson, D. & Morosan, D. (1986). Training non-native speech contrasts in adults: Acquisition of the English /θ/-/ð/ contrast. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 40, 205-215.
- Jusczyk, P. (1981). Infant speech perception: A critical appraisal. In P. Eimas and J. Miller (Eds.) *Perspectives on the Study of Speech*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lasky, R., Syrdal-Lasky, A., and Klein, R. (1975). VOT discrimination by four to six and a half month old infants from Spanish environments. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 20, 215-225.
- Lenneberg, E. (1967). *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley.
- Liberman, A., Cooper, M., Shankweiler, F. & Studdert-Kennedy, M. (1967). Perception of the speech code. *Psychological Review*, 74, 431-461.
- Mackain, K., Best, C. & Strange, W. (1981). Categorical perception of English /r/ and /l/ by Japanese bilinguals. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 2, 369-390.
- McClaskey, C., Pisoni, D. & Carrell, T. (1983). Transfer of training of new linguistic contrast in voicing. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 34, 331-337.
- Miyawaki, K., Strange, W. Verbrugge, R., Liberman, A., Jenkins J. & Fujimura, O. (1972). An effect of linguistic experience: The discrimination of /r/ and /l/ by native speakers of Japanese and English. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 18, 331-340.
- Pisoni, D., Aslin, R., Perey, R. & Hennessy, B. (1982). Some effects of laboratory training on identification and discrimination of voicing contrasts in stop consonants. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 8, 297-314.
- Politzer, R. & Weiss, L. (1969). Developmental aspects of

- auditory discrimination, echo response and recall. *The Modern Language Journal*, 53, 75-85.
- Sapon, S. & Carroll, J. (1958). Discriminative perception of speech sounds as a function of native language. *General Linguistics* 3, 62-72.
- Scholes, R. (1968). Phonemic interference as a perceptual phenomenon. *Language and Speech*, 11, 86-103.
- Scovel, T. (1981). The recognition of foreign accents in English and its implications for psycholinguistics theories of language acquisition. In *Proceedings of the 5th congress of AILA Quebec*: Les Presses de L'Universite Laval.
- Schouten, M. (1980). The case against a speech mode of perception. *Acta Psychologica*, 44, 71-98.
- Sheldon, A. & Strange, W. (1982). The acquisition of /r/ and /l/ by Japanese learners of English: Evidence that speech production can precede speech perception. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 3, 243-261.
- Simen, C. & Fourcin, A. (1978). Cross-language study of speech pattern learning. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 63, 925-955.
- Snow, C. & Hoefnagel-Hohle, M. (1978). The critical period for language acquisition: Evidence from L2 learning. *Child Development*, 49, 1114-1128.
- Stevens, K. & Halle, M. (1967). Remarks on analysis by synthesis and distinctive features. In W. Wathan-Dunn (Ed.) *Models for the Perception of Speech and Visual Form* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Strange, W. & Dittmann, S. (1984). Effects of discrimination training on the perception of /r-l/ by Japanese adults learning English. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 36, 131-145.
- Strange, W. & Jenkins, J. (1978). Role of linguistic experience in perception of speech. In R. Walk and H. Pick (Eds.) *Perception and Experience*. New York: Plenum Pres.
- Streeter, L. (1976). Language perception of two-month-old infants shows effects of both innate mechanisms and experience. *Nature*, 259, 3941.
- Streeter, L. & Landauer, T. (1976). Effects of learning ESL on the acquisition of a new phonemic contrast. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 59, 448-451.
- Tees, R. & Werker, J. (1984). Perceptual flexibility: maintenance or recovery of the ability to discriminate non-native speech sounds. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 579-

- Streeter, L. & Landauer, T. (1976). Effects of learning ESL on the acquisition of a new phonemic contrast. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 59, 448-451.
- Tees, R. & Werker, J. (1984). Perceptual flexibility: maintenance or recovery of the ability to discriminate non-native speech sounds. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 579-590.
- Trehub, S. (1976). The discrimination of foreign speech contrasts by infants and adults. *Child Development*, 47, 466-472.
- Werker, J. (1986). The effect of multilingualism on phonetic perceptual flexibility. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 7, 141-155.
- Werker, J., Gilbert, J., Humphrey, K., & Tees, R. (1985). Developmental aspects of cross-language speech perception. *Child Development*, 52, 349-355.
- Werker, J. & Logan, J. (1985). Cross-language evidence for three factors in speech perception. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 37, 35-44.
- Werker, J. & Tees, R. (1983). Developmental changes across childhood in the perception of non-native speech sounds. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 37, 278-286.
- Werker, J. & Tees, R. (1984). Phonemic and phonetic factors in adult cross-language speech perception. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 75, 1866-1878.
- Werker, J. & Tees, R. (1984). Cross-language speech perception: evidence for perceptual reorganization during the first year of life. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 7, 49-63.
- Williams, L. (1979). The modification of speech perception and production in second language learning. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 26, 95-104.
- Zlatin, M. & Koenigsnecht, R. (1975). Development of the voicing contrast: Perception of stop consonants. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 18, 541-553.

Soviet Language Planning and the Linguistic Assimilation of non-Russian Ethnic Groups in the USSR

CLAUDE O. PROCTOR, Jr.

What is the nature of Soviet language problems and to what extent, if any, have they been solved? Is there any evidence to support the view that the Soviet Union has and continues to pursue a policy of linguistic and cultural assimilation of the non-ethnic Russian minorities?

The research contained in this paper was motivated in two important directions by continuing Soviet claims that the country's language problems have been solved. In the first instance, it reviews the nature of Soviet nationality policy. Secondly, this paper presents the available evidence and examines the question of linguistic and cultural assimilation of the non-ethnic Russian minorities through Russian language and culture.

Language Planning and Terminology

Various terminologies such as *language planning*, *politics of language* and *language policy* are used to describe the process "in which governments and/or international bodies consciously attempt to assess linguistic needs, problems, and priorities and to establish guidelines whereby these goals may be met" (O'Barr, 1976: 5-6). For all intents and purposes, the term *language planning* is commonly used in Western literature to describe the aforementioned process. Nonetheless, the Soviet lexicon of terminologies and definitions often can be ambiguous and obscure. Soviet linguists commonly employ the terms *language policy* and *language construction* to encompass the concept of language planning: *language policy* is defined as "the theory and practice of a conscious influencing of the course of language development on the part of society," whereas *language construction* is "the creation of written languages, of schools taught in native languages, of orthographies, terminologies, of teaching texts, theoretical studies concerned with all the languages of Soviet people" (Isaev, 1977: 11-14). Thus the distinction between the two Soviet terms exists in the sense of theory: *language policy*, and practice: *language construction*.

Soviet Nationality Policy

Just as in many other areas of comparative analyses involving the tsarist and Soviet eras, there is a certain historical continuity in language policy as practiced during the Tsarist period prior to 1917 and that of the ensuing Soviet period. At the same time, there are important distinctions. The inherent feature of expansionism on the part of both the Russian and the Soviet states was initiated in the 16th century during the reign of Ivan the Terrible (Lewis, 1973). The momentum created by this initial thrust to the east and south continues even into the 20th century. Consequently, it has resulted in the creation of an immense multinational and multilingual state consisting of some 130 different groups and languages (Comrie, 1981). According to the 1970 Soviet census, ethnic Russians comprised a bare majority of 53.7 percent of the total population of the USSR (ibid.). Current demographic estimates cite a figure of approximately 51 percent. Given the dramatically increasing birth rate in the Central Asian republics and sporadic displays of nationalism in several of the non-Russian republics, the scenario has increasing implications for political stability in the country as well as challenges to the centralized administration of a nationalities policy.

Tsarist nationality policy differed in several important respects from that introduced and practiced by the Bolshvik government. Most importantly, it has been observed that the Tsarist approach to the nationality problem consistently pursued a dual policy of ruthless assimilation and suppression of national minorities. The net effect of this policy was to deter development of the national languages (Lewis, 1973).

On the other hand, official Soviet nationality policy permitting self-determination in the choice of national language is stated in Article 36 of the 1977 Constitution of the Soviet Union, which proclaims that all citizens of the USSR have the right "to use their native language and the languages of other peoples of the USSR" (Topornin, 1980). In reality, however, Soviet language policy takes its cue from a frequently quoted article entitled "Is a Compulsory Official Language Needed?" which was written by Lenin before the Bolsheviks came to power. In this work, Lenin essentially disdained the use of coercion and compulsion in propagating the Russian language among the country's nationalities, while at the same time he lauded the "great and mighty" Russian language and observed that "people whose life and work conditions make it necessary for them to know the

Russian language, will learn it without being forced to do so" (Aminov, 1985). In another important, but less frequently quoted, statement in the same context, Lenin wrote that the "requirements of economic exchange will always compel the nationalities living in one state . . . to study the language of the majority" (Xanazarov, 1983). Herein lies the contradiction that exists between the theory and practice of a nationalities policy as employed by the Soviet Union. While the constitution of 1977 and Lenin's former statement purport to allow individual national determination in the matter of language, his latter observation implicitly promotes the Russian language and, more importantly, it suggests the necessity for literacy in the common language of the majority—namely Russian—on the part of all the country's citizens of all nationalities in order to secure the economic and political base of the Soviet state.

In essence, Soviet policy toward the various nationalities is one whose consequence is integration and assimilation under the rubric of "national in form, but socialist in content." Each nationality is permitted to use its language and culture, but the content must adhere to the concept of a single socialist state whose ideals are promulgated in the Russian language, or in the words of the contemporary Soviet Sociologist Dr. Kuckar Xanazarov, Director of the philosophy and Law Institute of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences: "The Russian language, among other things, serves as a means of accumulating a single intellectual potential of the social community termed 'the Soviet people'" (1983: 12).

Soviet Successes in Language Planning

As a consequence of a comprehensive national language policy since the earliest days of the Bolshevik regime, the Soviet Union can lay legitimate claim to the propagation of education and bilingualism in the USSR. As reflected in a series of decrees beginning in 1917, the Soviet leaders recognize the necessity of providing education to a largely illiterate population and the benefits that would accrue in the creation of a new socialist society. One observer has noted the remarkable rise in literacy and that "between 1914 and 1969 the number of students in schools in the Soviet Union increased five fold" (Lewis, 1973: 154). In fact, Soviet data identify 1937, the 20th anniversary of Soviet power, as the year that full literacy was achieved in the Soviet Union (Isaev, 1977: 256).

Bilingualism, like education, also has been an enduring feature of Soviet language policy since the outset. However, bilingualism as defined in the Soviet context is a unique type in which only Russian is considered as a second language in addition to a citizen's native tongue. Therefore, all national groups are taught Russian as a second language, although as noted earlier, parents have the statutory right to have their children taught in their native language.

The noted Soviet linguist Dr. Magomet Izmajlovic Isaev has identified several historical stages in the application of language policy, i.e., "language construction", in the Soviet Union: (1) the improvement of old alphabets and written forms that occurred during the 1920's; (2) the transition to a Latin script and the creation of alphabets where none previously existed in the Central Asia, Volga, Siberia, and Caucasus regions during the 1920's and 1930's; (3) the transition of native alphabets to the Cyrillic (Russian) script during the later 1930's; and (4) the current stage, which began during the 1940's and 1950's, to further refine the native alphabets and orthographies (Isaev, 1977: 17-19).

Beginning in the 1970's, references in the Soviet media, various decrees and decisions, and a series of nationwide conferences involving educators, leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), and others reflected a growing concern about bilingualism and the teaching of Russian language to the non-ethnic Russian population. The documents and speeches of Union Republic leaders frequently point to the increasing necessity for fluency in the Russian language on the part of non-native Russians. Frequently these appeals take the form of advocating Russian as the language of access and advancement in modern Soviet society, as well as an "internationalizing" force for the diverse ethnic groups. The draft CPSU program published in 1985 encourages "mastering--along with the language of one's own nationality--of the Russian language, which . . . expands access to the achievements of science technology, and Soviet world culture" (Draft Party Program, 1985: 14-15).

According to Soviet statistics, the number of non-ethnic Russians who study the Russian language is steadily increasing. One source states that "in 1970, 13 million, and in 1979, 16.3 million, people of non-Russian nationalities called Russian their native language" and that "62 percent of all members of non-Russian nationalities are now fluent in Russian" ("Russian Fluency", 1983: 7-8). As a further illustration of what Soviet

language planners consider an obviously distinct achievement, Table 1 depicts the degree of mastery of the Russian language by selected nationalities in the USSR:

Table 1.
Degree of Mastery of the Russian Language by Nationalities
of the USSR (in percent)

Nationalities	1970	1979
Ukrainians	36.3	49.8
Uzbeks	14.5	49.3
Belorussians	49.0	57.0
Kazakhs	41.8	52.3
Tatars	62.5	68.9
Azerbaidzhanis	16.6	29.5
Armenians	30.1	38.6
Georgians	21.3	26.7
Moldavians	36.1	47.4
Tadzikhs	15.4	29.6
Lithuanians	35.9	52.1
Turkmenians	15.4	25.4
Kirgiz	19.1	29.4
Chuvash	58.4	64.8
Peoples of Dagestan	41.7	60.3
Latvians	45.2	56.7
Bashkirs	53.3	64.9
Poles	37.0	44.7

Source: "Soviet nationalities fluency" 1982: 5-6.

A major turning point in renewed Soviet emphasis on the teaching of Russian language occurred in June 1983 at a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, in which it was acknowledged that a poor knowledge of Russian inhibited the cultural and sociological process of a Soviet citizen. Subsequently, these concerns resulted in a sweeping reform of the Soviet education system, with implementation being introduced in phases over the next several years. In April 1984, both the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet approved guidelines for the reform of general and vocational schools to be implemented with the school year beginning September 1, 1984. A major change called for children to begin school at the age of six instead of seven and to complete eleven grades instead of ten. In addition, an important provision of the reform acknowledged that

46 / *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*

"additional measures must be taken to improve conditions for learning Russian" and that "a good command of Russian must become the norm for young people finishing secondary educational institutions " ("Guidelines for Reform", 1984: 2).

Apropos of the nationwide impact of the reform, testimonials from the Soviet press frequently describe the extent of Russian language instruction in the national, i.e., non-ethnic Russian, republic schools and the increasing mastery of Russian by non-Russians, especially in the Central Asia and Caucasus republics. For example, Professor Azim Xadziev, department head at the Institute of Language and Literature in Uzbekistan states:

The republic has over 10,000 general secondary schools. Teaching is done in Uzbek at 7,000 schools, and in Russian --at 2,000 schools. Teaching is done both in Uzbek and Russian at more than 1,000 schools. ("Blossoming of Uzbek" 1985: 9)

Similarly, A.K. Karoypkulov, head of the Kirgiz Communist party Central Committee's Department of Scholarship and Educational Institutions observes:

About 70 percent of the Kindergartens with a multinational student body operate in Russian . . . And in the national [i.e., Kirgiz-language] kindergartens of most districts, Russian-language instruction has been organized in various forms for the children. ("Kirgizia Reports", 1983: 8).

And from the Caucasus republic of Azerbaijan:

There are 200,000 students in 428 schools with Russian as the language of instruction. Almost half of them are Azerbaijani. Russian language in the national school is taught from the preparatory grade to the 10th grade [11th grade under the new reform] inclusively ("ja russkij by Vyucil", 1983: 7).

Language Planning Problems in the Soviet Union

As noted at the outset of this paper, the official Soviet view maintains that the Soviet Union has solved its nationalities and language problem on the basis of the Leninist principle of equality of nationalities and languages in the USSR.

However, the Soviet press occasionally reveals continuing problems with the nationality and language questions. Shortly after the politburo decision in mid-1983 to improve Russian language instruction in the national schools, one Soviet educator was very explicit in acknowledging that indeed problems still existed:

The success in resolving the nationalities question -- including those in the sphere of language--do not, of course, signify by any means that all the problems caused by the very fact of living and working within the framework of a single state with a multiplicity of nations and nationalities are disappearing. The handling of language is one of the most important factors in a correct, scientifically regulated nationalities policy ("Russian Fluency", 1983: 7)

Other Soviet observers have noted that Russian language instruction continues to be unsatisfactory in many of the national-language schools, especially in the rural areas of the country; that some republics are experiencing shortages of textbooks, visual aids, properly equipped language laboratories; and, most importantly, that the institutes are graduating Russian-language teachers who have a poor knowledge of Russian and inadequate training in instructional methodologies to the extent that some secondary school students fail to master the required curriculum ("Why Tuva's Students Fail", 1985: 11-12).

Of course, limited fluency in the Russian language--the language of access and advancement in the Soviet Union--has important and disturbing implications for the country's economy, society, defense and general welfare. Certainly the military aspects of limited Russian language fluency in the non-ethnic Russian republics, especially the republics in Central Asia and the Caucasus, have not been overlooked by Soviet authorities. A recent article in *Krasnaja Zvezda* (*Red Star*), related the experience of one of their correspondents to a unit of the Urals Military District involved in non-commissioned officer training:

for instance, the training of all seven [recruits] sent from the Kurgan-Tyube Oblast in Tajikistan and five of the seven sent from Azerbaijan last spring had to be discontinued because they had insufficient knowledge of Russian . . . Visits to military Commissariats in the Central Asian and Transcaucasian Military Districts showed that some had difficulty in finding the necessary number of qualified recruits ("Recruits Unqualified", 1986).

In reality, it has been observed that this lack of Russian language fluency by non-ethnic Russian recruits usually relegates them to low-prestige military units, dictates perfunctory manual labor, and disqualifies them in competing for leadership positions in the commissioned and non-commissioned officer corps (Pond, 1981: 137). Nonetheless, the problem is not limited to the Soviet military organization. The Soviet system of education beyond the secondary level is based on a series of comprehensive

examinations, which require fluency in the Russian Language, in order for the prospective student to pursue advanced technical training or professional education.

Linguistic and Cultural Assimilation

The crux of the issue is whether in the process of promoting bilingualism and eradicating illiteracy, the Soviet Union has embarked upon a course of linguistic and cultural assimilation of the non-Russian nationalities. Once again, Soviet pronouncements on matters of nationalities policy provide conflicting but revealing clues to a process of "convergence" and "internationalization" of all nations and nationalities in the USSR.

Indeed, the new CPSU program announced in 1985 signals yet another phase in nationality policy, when it acknowledges that there are "new tasks in improving relations between nationalities." The two tenets of Soviet nationality policy for the period ahead are especially revealing:

the all-out strengthening and development of the Soviet multi-national state . . . developing a single culture of the Soviet people-socialist in content, diverse in national forms and internationalist in spirit . . . The growth and convergence of national cultures and the consolidation of their interrelationships make their mutual enrichment even more fruitful ("Draft party program" 1985: 14).

This formula for assimilation reinforces the idea of a single Soviet culture and lends credence to Western claims of Russian linguistic and cultural assimilation of various national groups through a simultaneous process of diluting ethnic identity and promoting a sense of common identity.

Soviet theorists on the nationality question use a variety of terminologies to describe their process of creating a "single culture" and a "single national-economic complex" of the Soviet people, e.g., "convergence", "internationalization", etc. The most commonly used term *sblizenie* [convergence] apparently was introduced in 1961 by Nikita Xruscev in the new party program at the 22nd CPSU Congress (Rakowska-Harmstone, 1974: 18). During the two ensuing decades the terms convergence and internationalization have become euphemistic ones in the Soviet ideological lexicon to describe what Western observers frequently regard as "Russification" and "linguistic and cultural assimilation". Speaking at the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Professor Tadeusz Swietochowski called Russification the central question for the people of Azerbaijan. He

noted that Soviet Azerbaijan is undergoing a process of increasing linguistic and cultural assimilation that is "voluntary, spontaneous, independent of the intentions of the regime, and unrelated to the political attitudes of the Azerbaijani people" ("Soviet Azerbaijan Today", 1985).

The problem of assimilation in the Soviet Union must be examined in the context of both demography and language. In terms of demography, the USSR is a multinational state and a federation of union republics, autonomous republics, autonomous *oblasts* [regions], and autonomous *okrugs* [areas]. These four categories of administrative units were formed for the purpose of recognizing the major ethnic groups in the country. At the present time, there are 15 union republics, 19 autonomous republics, 8 autonomous oblasts, and 10 autonomous okrugs. However, the demographic dominance of Russians in a majority of ethnic administrative areas is readily apparent. Of course, the largest union republic, the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFR) is comprised of 82.8 percent ethnic Russians. Another of the 15 union republics, the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR), has a population that is 42.5 percent Russian and 32.6 percent Kazakh (Comrie, 1981: 282). A total of 9 of the 19 autonomous republics [ASSR] are demographically dominated by the Russian population:

Bashkir ASSR	Russian: 40.5%, Tatar: 24.7%, Bashkir: 23.4%
Buryat ASSR	Russian: 73.5%, Buryat: 22.0%
Kalmyk ASSR	Russian : 45.8%, Kalmyk: 41.1%
Karelian ASSR	Russian: 68.1%, Karelian: 11.8%
Komi ASSR	Russian : 53.1%, Komi: 28.6%
Mari ASSR	Russian : 46.9%, Mari : 43.7%
Mordva ASSR	Russian: 58.9%, Mordva: 35.4%
Udmurt ASSR	Russian : 57.1%, Udmurt : 34.2%
Yakut ASSR	Russian : 47.3%, Yakut : 43.
(Comrie: 283-84)	

Similarly, six of the eight autonomous *oblasts* [AO] show a Russian predominance:

50 / Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Adyge AO	Russian: 71.7%, Adyge: 21.1%
Jewish AO	Russian: 83.7%, Jew : 6.6%
Karachay- Cherkes AO	Russian: 47.1%, Karachay: 28.2%, Cherkes: 9.1%]
Khakas AO	Russian: 78.4%, Khakas: 12.3%
Mountain- Altay AO	Russian : 65.6%, Altay: 27.8
(Comrie: 284)	

And, finally, at the lowest administrative level, ethnic Russians significantly outnumber the eponymous population in 8 of the 10 national *okrugs* [NO]:

Chukchi NO	Russian: 69.7%, Chukchi : 10.9%
Evenki NO	Russian: 61.1%, Evenki: 25.3%
Khanty-Mansi NO	Russian: 76.9%, Khanty : 4.5%, Mansi: 2.5%
Koryak NO	Russian : 63.0%, Koryak : 19.1%
Nenets NO	Russian: 64.5%, Nenets : 15.0%
Tamyr NO	Russian : 66.9%, Dolgan : 11.4%, Nenets: 5.9%
Ust' -Ordynskiy- Buryat NO	Russian: 58.8%, Buryat: 33.0%
Yamal-Nenets NO	Russian: 46.9%, Nenets: 21.9%
(Comrie: 284-85)	

The evidence of linguistic domination by the Russian language is even more compelling. Whereas Russian demographic domination through a formalized ethnic administrative structure is a feature of the Soviet period, the linguistic assimilation of nationalities has its historical roots in the language policy of the tsars. Nonetheless, it remained for Soviet language planners to structure and formalize the political and linguistic process of "Sovietizing" and "Russianizing" through Russian the languages of the approximately 130 other ethnic groups of the Soviet Union.

The initial thrust of the influence of the Russian language occurred as a result of a resolution passed in 1935 to establish an All-Union Central Committee for the New Alphabet. The purpose of this committee was to develop literary (according to the Soviet definition, these are languages that have developed a written tradition) languages, orthographies, terminology, grammar and

dictionaries for various nationalities in the Soviet Union (Isaev: 259).

In the first instance, the languages of a number of the country's ethnic groups, including those of Central Asia and the Caucasus, experienced both orthographical and phonological changes as the result of a conversion to Russian (Cyrillic) script. Isaev has noted a number of these changes in his study of national languages in the USSR: (1) the introduction of soft consonants [e.g., *Kul'tura*] in Ossetian, (2) the voiced and voiceless labiodental [v] and the affricate [c] in Kalmyk, (3) the voiced and voiceless labiodentals [v] and [f] and the affricate [c] in Turkmen, (4) the palatal voiceless [k] in Azerbaijani, (5) the phonemes [v, f, x, c, sc, z] in Kirgiz (Isaev: 361-62).

By 1940, all the native alphabets had experienced cyrillization to one degree or another with the exception of a few languages such as Armenian and Georgian. The Soviet linguists made a case for using Russian because it provided a common linguistic basis, possessed a better range of sounds than Latin, and-with 33 basic letters-required fewer additional symbols to represent the sounds of the various national languages (Isaev: 270). Table 2 [p. 52] illustrates the extent of Cyrillic influences on the native alphabets of several major non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union.

An equally important consequence of "language construction" in the Soviet Union continues to be the "Sovietization" or "Politicization" of national languages by Russian through what Soviet linguists call "Sovietisms" or an "international vocabulary" (Isaev: 356). In this sense, the Russian language serves as a conduit for transmitting various foreign and domestic words and terminologies into the national literary languages such as: *sovet* [soviet]; *kommunizm* [communism]; *kolhoz* [collective farm]; *pjatiletka* [five-year plan]; *sputnik* [satellite], etc.

The so-called minor nationalities, the majority of which possessed no written tradition of their own, exhibit the most graphic influences of linguistic assimilation by the Russian language. For example, all twenty of what Soviet linguists call the small nationalities of the North and Siberia (e.g., Aysor, etc.) claim Russian and the remaining seven claim either Azerbaijani or Georgian as their literary language; in Central Asia seven of the ten minor nationality groups claim Russian and three Tadjik; and all four of the remaining small nationalities (e.g., Veps, Izhora,

52 / Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Table 2
Some Orthographic Influences of Cyrillic on Native Alphabets

ROMANIZED	RUSSIAN	AZERI	KAZAKH	KIRGIZ	TADJIK	TURKIC	UIGHUR	UZBEK
а	а	а, э	а, э	а	а	а, э	а, э	а
б	б	б	б	б	б	б	б	б
в	в	в	в	в	в	в	в	в
г	г	г, ғ	г, ғ	г	г, ғ	г	г, ғ	г, ғ
д	д	д, э	д, э	д, э	д, э	д, э	д, э	д, э
е	е	е	е	е	е	е	е	е
з	з	з	з	з	з	з	з	з
и	и	и, ы	и, ы	и	и, ы	и	и, ы	и, ы
к	к	к, қ	к, қ	к	к, қ	к	к, қ	к, қ
л	л	л	л	л	л	л	л	л
м	м	м	м	м	м	м	м	м
н	н	н, ң	н, ң	н, ң	н, ң	н, ң	н, ң	н, ң
о	о	о, ғ	о, ғ	о, ғ	о, ғ	о, ғ	о, ғ	о, ғ
п	п	п	п	п	п	п	п	п
р	р	р	р	р	р	р	р	р
с	с	с	с	с	с	с	с	с
т	т	т	т	т	т	т	т	т
у	у	у, ы	у, ы	у, ы	у, ы	у, ы	у, ы	у, ы
ф	ф	ф	ф	ф	ф	ф	ф	ф
х	х	х, ғ	х, ғ	х	х, ғ	х	х, ғ	х, ғ
ц	ц	ц	ц	ц	ц	ц	ц	ц
ч	ч	ч	ч	ч	ч	ч	ч	ч
ш	ш	ш	ш	ш	ш	ш	ш	ш
ъ	ъ	ъ	ъ	ъ	ъ	ъ	ъ	ъ
ь	ь	ь	ь	ь	ь	ь	ь	ь
э	э	э	э	э	э	э	э	э
ю	ю	ю	ю	ю	ю	ю	ю	ю
я	я	я	я	я	я	я	я	я

Source: "Transliteration Tables", 1984: TT 1-10.

Karaim, and Liv) claim Russian along with either Ukrainian or Lithuanian (Baziev and Isaev 1973: 122-23). Indeed, in discussing the Soviet manipulation of languages in Southern Siberia and the cyrillician process, the linguist Jan Knappert observes the real impact and implications of Russian for the various nationality groups:

In this way the speakers of the Turkic dialects will be tied to Russian as the central language of the country, and will be less conscious of their relations with their neighbors. They are not able to understand them as soon as the conversation turns to a more educated subject: then Russian has to be used (qtd. in O'Barr: 6).

Accordingly, the aforementioned data are a strong indicator of the comprehensive nature of linguistic assimilation by means of Russian orthography; Soviet political, technical and economic terminology; and a written language tradition that occurs through exposure to Russian and Soviet literature.

Conclusion

Professor Bernard Comrie, a recognized scholar on languages of the USSR, offers this appraisal of language policy in the Soviet Union today:

Current trends suggest that all but the largest, most consolidated speech-communities will probably eventually go over to Russian (or one of the other large speech-communities): with some small speech-communities this process is almost complete, but in many other instances it seems that we are in the middle of a very long process of gradual linguistic assimilation (37).

Indeed, inasmuch as language and culture are inseparable and linguistic assimilation is a reliable precursor of cultural assimilation, the evidence is considerable-if not overwhelming-that the small nationality groups have indeed been assimilated by the Russian language and culture. This same linguistic and cultural assimilation process has made important inroads into the other major national languages and only a few of the non-slavic languages, such as Georgian and Armenian, which have their own strong literary and language traditions, have managed to avoid the linguistic effects of "Russification" for the most part.

In conclusion, although the Soviet Union disclaims any official policy of "Russification", its language policy of gradual *sblizenie* of the non-ethnic Russian minorities, in fact, has all the appearances of linguistic and cultural assimilation.

REFERENCES

- Aminov, A.. (1985). What is the truth about Russian language study in the USSR? *Moscow News*. 6-13 Oct. 1985: 13.
- Baziev, A.T. and I.M. Isaev (1973). *Jacyx i nacija* [Language and nation]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka."
- Comrie, B. (1981). *The language of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- Data on Soviet nationalities fluency in Russian. (1982). *Current digest of the Soviet Press*. 22 Sept. 1982: 5-6.
- Guidelines for reform of general and vocational schools. (1984). *Moscow News*. 10 June 1984: 1-8.
- Isaev, M.I. (1977). *National languages in the USSR: problems and solutions*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Ja russkij by vyucil . . . [I would study Russian . . .] (1983). *Pravda*. 22 Aug. 1983: 7.

54 / *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*

- Kirgizia reports improved Russian instruction. (1983). *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*. 6 July 1983: 8-9.
- Lewis, G. E. (1973). *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union*. The Hague: Mouton.
- O'barr, W. M. and F. Jean (1976). *Language and politics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Pond, E. (1981) *From the Yaroslavsky Station*. New York: Universe Books.
- Rakowska-Harmstone, T. (1974). The dialectics of nationalism in the USSR. *Problems of Communism*. May-June 1974: 18.
- Recruits selected for training as NCOs unqualified. (1986). *Radio Liberty Research Bulletin*. 29 Oct. 1986.
- Russian fluency for ethnic minorities. (1983). *Current digest of the Soviet Press*. 6 July 1983: 7-8.
- Soviet Azerbaijan today. (1985). *Meeting Report*. Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies.
- The blossoming of the Uzbek language. (1985). *Moscow News*. 7-14 April 1985: 9.
- The draft party program (new version). (1985). *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*. 27 Nov. 1985: 14-15.
- Topornin, B. (1980). *The new constitution of the USSR*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Transliteration tables. (1984). *USSR Guidebook*. Washington: Joint Publications Research Service.
- What is the truth about Russian language study in the USSR? (1985). *Moscow News*. 6-13 Oct. 1985: 13.
- Why Tuva's students fail to master Russian. (1985). *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*. 14 Aug. 1985: 11-12.
- Xanazarov, Kuckar. (1983). My 130 native languages. *Moscow News*. 2-9 Jan. 1983: 12.

Overcoming Difficulties in Testing Oral Competency: a Discussion of Facilitating Factors

ELAINE M. PHILLIPS

The recent interest in oral proficiency on the part of foreign language educators can be noticed on several fronts. The focus in many classrooms has shifted to include communicative competence as well as linguistic competence. The style, if not the substance, of new textbooks and the large number of proficiency-oriented sessions at professional meetings are also indicators that oral proficiency is an area of high interest among language teachers of the '80s, and rightly so. The ability to function verbally in a second language, to use the language for realistic purposes and in real-life situations is a very valid classroom goal.

To encourage this authentic language in students, oral work must be more than a mere recitation of dialogs or participation in structured drills. By now everyone has heard the joke of the French (or Spanish, or German) student talking about a trip to Europe who concludes "but when I got to France (Spain/Germany) no one knew the other half of the dialog!" Much more emphasis is being placed to day on "real communication," "Meaningful activity," -what students can do with the language structures they are studying rather than what they know about the language.

To develop proficiency in a second language, students must practice using language in a natural situation in so far as that is possible-in most cases within the confines of the classroom. Once teachers have become convinced of the ease and the importance of devoting an appropriate amount of time to developing students' oral proficiency through directed classroom activities, they soon realize that, in order to convince students of the importance of oral skills, these skills must be evaluated periodically. Students know that if a skill is important, it will be tested; conversely, if the skill is not tested, teachers are hard pressed to convince students that it is important. In fact, Upshur (1971) believes that teachers do not teach if they do not test. Testing, evaluating, and explaining allow students to make appropriate changes in speech behaviors. These changes are manifestations of learning.

Following is a discussion of three problems many teachers will face in implementing oral testing and an attempt at offering possible solutions to those problems.

Problems in Oral Testing

Teachers who have realized the necessity for testing speaking skills are often overwhelmed by the apparent difficulty of the problems involved: how to find the time, how to develop tests, how to evaluate performance. High school teachers may have as many as 125 students a day or more, while instructors at the post-secondary level may have upwards of 75 students in a beginning language classes. Where do teachers find the time to administer oral exams to such a large number of students?

If teachers do manage to find the time to administer so many oral exams, the next dilemma they face is selecting the kind of exam to be administered. Several standardized tests, such as the MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests, and the Pimsleur Proficiency Tests, though available, are usually indirect tests of speaking ability, and Clark (1975) indicates that the evidence does not support a high level of scoring reliability for standardized speaking tests. Non-speaking tests such as reduced redundancy, cloze procedures, and dictation, though they might correlate highly with speaking ability, do not motivate speaking practice and improvement, and thus have little face validity for most students.

Standard tests often include the following types of tasks: pronunciation, manipulative drills, response to a written or taped question, reading aloud, mimicry, picture description, or monolog. While all the above may be valid tasks for testing certain aspects of linguistic ability, none seem truly appropriate for testing whether or not students are actually proficient in the language. Clark (1972) believes there is no close or readily identifiable relationship between competence in communicating and linguistic ability. The correlation is tenuous at best because linguistic weaknesses can be by-passed through circumlocution; acceptability of forms vary from interlocutor to interlocutor; and the redundancy of "real" language allows for comprehension in spite of linguistic defects. Consequently, a test which emphasizes accuracy over adequacy can not be considered a test of communicative competence.

Clark (1975) finds there is no measurement technique of oral proficiency with more face validity than the oral proficiency interview used by the Foreign Service Institute: the Inter-agency Language Roundtable (ILR) oral interview. The American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has adapted the ILR rating scale to a level appropriate for educators and has trained language teachers as oral proficiency interviewers in several foreign languages, the most common being French, Spanish, and German.

The percentage of language teachers trained as oral interviewers is quite small, but teachers do not need to be trained oral interviewers to test the oral proficiency of their students. In any case, the time required to administer periodic (two to three per semester) oral interviews to all students would be prohibitive. In addition, the classroom teacher is interested, not only in the general proficiency of the students, but also in their specific ability to communicate about the topics and to accomplish the functions that have been covered in the classroom.

Evaluation of these abilities is the third problem confronting teachers faced with administering oral exams. Many solutions, from the sketchiest to the very detailed, have been offered to solve this problem. Callaway (1980) contends that most evaluators make holistic judgements rather than evaluating separate components of the language sample and says "dividing oral performance into components is superfluous at best and artifactual at worst." Further, students may feel that evaluation of oral performance is too subjective and that feedback is too vague. With such problems confronting language teachers, it is no wonder that so many of them decide to forego the evaluation procedure.

Some Possible Solutions

Setting up role-playing situations for small groups of students and using a simplified evaluative scale may relieve some of the burden of oral testing for teachers. The rest of this paper will elaborate on and explicate this simple suggestion as a means of alleviating the three problems discussed above.

The most obvious solution to easing the time strain on teachers is to test more than one student at a time. By testing students in groups of threes, the time necessary for administering oral exams can be cut by nearly two-thirds. In classes of average size (25 students), teachers can administer exams to students in groups of threes in about one class period. While the teacher is listening to each group, the remaining students are working in pairs or individually on tasks assigned by the teacher. The teacher may also prefer to test on two consecutive days for half of the class period. University teachers have the advantage of using their office hours and other time outside of class for oral exams, and as they seldom last more than a few minutes, students rarely object.

In situations where groups of three students can not be formed, teachers could use groups of four or two students, depending on the situation to be developed. The teacher will never participate and will

want to vary the students in the "odd" groups on successive exams. In this writer's experience, groups of three seem to work best because groups of two tend to reflect more sharply any differences in ability levels, and groups of four seem too crowded and do not allow sufficient time for expression.

For students, one of the greatest advantages of group-testing is that it seems to relieve some of their anxiety and take off some of the pressure inherent in the testing situation. If they are not attending to their nerves, students have more attention to devote to the task at hand. Teachers can de-emphasize the evaluative nature of the situation and lower the students' affective filters even more by having the students sit facing each other in a small circle while the evaluator sits discretely outside the circle and listens to the conversation without contributing. Under these circumstances, the role of impartial observer is best for teachers whose natural inclination is to help students. As Wilkinson (1968) indicates, "A sympathetic interviewer [teacher] might win speech from stones who are in any other situation unspeaking." If students have had a great deal of practice in class doing partner- or small-group work, they will feel much more comfortable with the situation at exam time. It would appear that any steps that can be taken to reduce anxiety will improve students performance. Steinberg and Horwitz' (1986:135) research reported that "subjects undergoing experimental treatment aimed at making them feel anxious and 'on the spot' described visual stimuli less interpretively than did subjects in a relaxed, comfortable environment." Steinberg and Horwitz also comment that, although the research conditions were somewhat artificial, "the situation probably seemed quite credible to the many students who feel the constant pressure of evaluation in the second language classroom."

Many teachers and students fear that in a group testing situation, a less prepared student will bring down the grades of the students who are well prepared. Another concern is that better students will overpower and leave the weaker student out of the conversation altogether. These are possibilities, to be sure, but the probability of this happening can be eliminated by teaching students at the beginning of language study some elementary conversational skills and useful expressions. Bragger and Rice's conversational manual for French students, *Du Tac Au Tac* (1987) offers some excellent suggestions, some examples of which are given below:

Expressions used to react: Vraiment? Incroyable! Je comprends. C'est vrai! Nous sommes d'accord. [Really? Unbelievable! I understand. It's true. We agree.]

Expressions used to stall for time: Euh . . . bon . . . voyons . . . mais . . . donc . . . tu sais. [Umm, well, let's see, but, therefore, you know]

Other examples of expressions are given to aid students in asking for clarification, getting additional information, helping the speaker, getting into the conversation, drawing others into the conversation, and backtracking.

Teachers may compile common words and expressions in each language, though students should not be required to memorize lists but should be allowed to choose the expressions they find helpful. The list of expressions can be expanded as students move from the beginning to the intermediate level. First year students might be taught "Et toi?" [and you?] as an expression useful in eliciting a classmate's opinion while second year students might learn "Qu'est-ce que tu en penses?" [What do you think about it?] The expressions should naturally have been practiced with partners and used by the teacher many times in class. Teaching these simple conversational techniques allows the quicker students to shine at exam time by using the expressions appropriately to facilitate the conversations, thereby helping the weaker students, encouraging them, and including them in the conversation. Thus, group testing benefits teachers by saving them valuable time, reducing students' anxiety, and providing support for both stronger and weaker students.

In deciding on the kind of oral test to use periodically, the teacher will probably not select a standardized test. Regularly administered test of speaking skills will be related to materials covered in class; e.g., vocabulary themes, (places in a town, buildings); functions (asking directions, giving directions); structures (immediate future time). Proficiency exams should deal with global ability, and achievement tests with accuracy and content. Because teachers will probably want to elicit particular subject matter while keeping proficiency as a goal, the proposed oral exam may best be called a pro-achievement test. It will cover specific material (vocabulary, structures) from the chapter or chapters, but the emphasis will be on what students can do with the material (function) rather than what they know about the material (form). Teachers will prepare situation cards in English for the students, similar to those used in the

ACTFL oral proficiency interview but related to the topics covered recently in class. Care must be taken in setting up a situation specifically to elicit certain structures. It is easy to arrange a communicative situation where students need to use the past tense, for example, but difficult to find a situation where students must use demonstrative adjectives. Some structures are better suited to written tests, though teachers may make note of students who use them spontaneously.

More open-ended situations seem to work best for intermediate and advanced level students (at least second-year) because they supply the general framework for the situation without requiring too many details and allow students to fill in creatively. When students understand the grading procedure to be followed (*infra*), they are encouraged to add additional material of their own to the situation. Beginning students may need to be given more details on their situation cards. They tend to monitor so heavily that they often have little attention capacity left over for thinking of what to say. "Discuss some of your weekend plans with your two roommates" may be sufficient instructions for intermediate students but could leave beginners stupefied. Because they tend to rely much more heavily on the situation card, a more appropriate card for this level would include some suggestions about what the plans include, e.g., seeing a movie, studying, etc., while still leaving the student the opportunity to fill in with real plans if desired. Below are sample situations with explanations that could be given to first year and second year students.

First year: "It is your first day at the university and you are about to meet your roommates for the first time. Greet the other students, and during the course of the conversation, as you get to know each other, find out the following information about your new pals: where they are from, what their family is like (sisters?, brothers?), what they plan to study, what their favorite leisure activities are, anything else you want to know."

Before this test, students will have practiced greetings, talking about families, and likes and dislikes. Students are reminded that they should make the conversation as natural as possible—they are not grilling a job applicant, after all—and they should not panic if they forget a word. If, for example, they cannot remember the word for brother, they should know that there are other, indirect ways to get the same information. If students have practiced paraphrase and

alternate questions forms-even at the beginning level-they will feel more comfortable using these techniques during group-testing.

Second year: "You are having dinner with two friends when the conversation turns to funny things that happened in the past. You contribute to the entertainment by telling a story about something humorous that happened to you, a family member, or a friend."

Preceding this group-test, students will have had practice in narrating and using transitional expressions and the past tenses. Students are cautioned to develop their narrative, giving plenty of details and to react naturally as the other students are relating their stories. One seldom waits till the end of a story to show any reaction.

A word of caution is proffered for teachers who are writing their own situation cards. Some situations require that each student's card be slightly different: they will have different information to impart or acquire. It is good to practice the situation in English with a colleague to ensure the situation cards are a good "fit." It is also important to assure that students have had ample opportunity to practice the various language functions required during the group-testing, e.g., giving directions, requesting information, greetings. Students may have practiced similar situations or parts of the situation, but the group-test situation cards are in no way rehearsed or memorized by the students. The evaluative experience is not to test memory but proficiency.

The problem that troubles many teachers is that of finding a suitable evaluation technique. A quick review of the literature will turn up a large variety of oral evaluation forms, but this writer has found the following form to be the simplest and the most adequate for grading purposes:

Grading System

- F - Student fails to appear for exam.
- D - Student fails to complete the task (i.e., does not say enough, cannot be understood, makes a gross cultural error).
- C - Student successfully completes the task as presented.
- B - Student successfully completes the task and stands out either by the correctness of language or by the extra material added to the situation.
- A - Student successfully completes the task and stands out both by the correctness of the language and by the extra material added to

the situation.

Students should be very familiar with the evaluation form before testing begins. The form allows students to receive a C on their oral performance by simply completing the task. Those students who want a higher grade have the incentive to be creative and add additional material to the original situation. The amount of material that can be added will vary, of course, according to the level of the student. Teachers can emphasize that the extra material is in addition to and not instead of the assigned task. Students who do not speak enough or who "misspeak" committing serious cultural blunders may receive a D, but only those who do not contribute at all would receive an F. Though a grade of A requires the addition of original material and accuracy, it is not impossible for students to get an A. In taking the accuracy component into consideration, teachers will want to review the ACTFL proficiency guidelines and remember that in high school and lower-division university classes, students seldom surpass the intermediate range of proficiency (Carroll, 1967). Consequently, "stands out by the correctness of the language" is a relative term and does not mean that the student has made no mistakes. Even students who make hundreds on objective tests will often, and completely unaware, use the present tense to talk about past time.

In addition to the grade notation, teachers may wish to give students more specific feed-back on the various subcategories of their oral performance. Although the elaboration of sub-skills may seem unnecessary to some (in testing proficiency, certain skills can make up for the lack of others), many students are comforted by the written, concretely expressed reaction of their teacher. The writer has found a format (Appendix 1) that is useful in providing information to students about individual performances. Teachers may rate fluency, pronunciation, amount of input, and accuracy on a scale of one to five. The form takes only seconds to complete and in some instances explicates a grade, such as input in the case of a B and accuracy in the case of an A. Beginning and even intermediate students should be assured that marks of one, two, or three are common and appropriate, considering the limited contact hours they have had with the language.

Conclusion

The relationship between teaching and testing and between testing and learning cannot be ignored. Teachers cannot fail to test

elements they consider to be integral parts of the foreign language curriculum. Tests obviously serve to measure students' progress, but it should also be remembered that they serve as powerful motivators as well. Tests of communicative competence in particular indicate to students what they can do in the "real" world and serve as reminders to teachers that preparation for the real world is a primary function of the educator (Savignon, 1983). The proficiency testing format described in this paper emphasizes the interactive nature of communicative competence; its adequacy, and not its accuracy. Perhaps the suggested solutions to some of the most compelling problems associated with oral testing will encourage more teachers to attempt this procedure.

REFERENCES

- Bragger, J.D. and D.P. Rice (1987). *Du Tac Au Tac..* Boston: Heinle.
- Callaway, D. (1980). Accent and evaluation of ESL oral proficiency. *Research in Language Testing*. (Ed.) J.W. Oller and K. Perkins. Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Carroll, J.B. (1967). *The Foreign Language Attainments of Language Majors in the Senior Year: a Survey Conducted in U.S. Colleges and Universities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Graduate School of Education.
- Clark, J.L.D. (1972). *Foreign Language Testing: Theory and Practice*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- (1975). Theoretical and technical considerations in oral proficiency testing. *Testing Language Proficiency*. (Ed.) R.L. Jones and B. Spolsky. Arlington: Cal, 10-28.
- Davies, A. Ed. (1968). *Language Testing Symposium*. London: Oxford.
- Lindner, C. Ed. (1977). *Oral Communication Testing: a Handbook for the Foreign Language Teacher*. Skokie: NTC, 6-7.
- Savignon, S.J. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Steinberg, F.S. and E.K. Horwitz (1986). The effect of induced anxiety on the denotative and interpretive content of second language speech. *TESOL Quarterly*. 20, 131-36.
- Upshur, J.A. (1971). Objective evaluation of oral proficiency in the ESOL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 4, 47-59.
- Wilkinson, A. (1968). The testing of oracy. *Language Testing Symposium*. (Ed.) A. Davies. London: Oxford.

Appendix

Feedback on Components of Individual Performance

I. Fluency

General definition: does not refer to absolute speed of delivery, since native speakers of any language often show wide variations in this area. Fluency refers to overall smoothness, continuity, and naturalness of the student's speech, as opposed to pauses for rephrasing sentences, groping for words, and so forth.

Definition on each level of the scale:

1. Very many unnatural pauses, frequently halting and fragmentary delivery.
2. Quite a few unnatural pauses, frequently halting and fragmentary delivery.
3. Some unnatural pauses, occasionally halting and fragmentary delivery.
4. Hardly any unnatural pauses, fairly smooth and effortless delivery.
5. No unnatural pauses, almost effortless and smooth, but still perceptibly nonnative.
6. As effortless and smooth as speech of native speaker.

II. Comprehensibility

General definition: refers to the ability of the student to make himself understood-to convey meaning.

Definition on each level of the scale:

1. No comprehension -could not understand anything the student said.
2. Comprehended small bits and pieces, isolated words.
3. Comprehended some phrases or word clusters.
4. Comprehended short, simple sentences.
5. Comprehended most of what the student said.
6. Comprehended all of what the student said.

III. Amount of communication

General definition: refers to the quantity of information relevant to the communicative situation the student is able to convey.

Definition on each level of the scale:

1. Virtually no relevant information was conveyed by the student.
2. Very little relevant information was conveyed by the student.
3. Some relevant information was conveyed by the student.

4. A fair amount of relevant information was conveyed by the student.
5. Most relevant information was conveyed by the student.
6. All relevant information was conveyed by the student.

IV. Quality of communication

General definition: refers to the linguistic (grammatical) correctness of the student's statements.

Definition at each level of the scale:

1. No statements were structurally correct
2. Very few statements were structurally correct.
3. Some statements were structurally correct, but many structural problems remain.
4. Many correct statements, but some problems remain with structures.
5. Most statements were structurally correct; only minor problems with structure.
6. All statements were structurally correct.

(Lindner, 1977)

REVIEWS

The Writing Process: 20 Projects for Group Work. Nancy Arapoff Cramer. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1985. pp. 331.

The Writing Process contains a preface, twenty illustrated composition modules, and an appendix. The purpose of the text is to provide a composition workbook for high-intermediate ESL/EFL adult population. The author presents four instructional premises on which she feels the workbook should be based. The premises are: (1) students working at advanced levels of language require practice; (2) working in collaborative groups fosters the most dynamic environment for stimulating learning, with the instructor as facilitator; (3) the true product of composition evolves only after mastery of a complex set of processes; and (4) high level ESL/EFL students require little direct instruction in grammar. While the language of the workbook is geared towards the student, printed instructional aids are provided, for which the instructor may find use. There is no companion teacher's guide for the text.

Careful consideration of language teaching approaches and methods reveals that, in isolation, relatively few techniques present fresh ideas as to how the field can improve upon instruction. Consequently, most practitioners have adopted an eclectic approach to language instruction, in the belief that the discipline can be enhanced by compound strategizing in the foreign language classroom (Bowen et al. 1985). No aspect of second language (L2) performance is more apt to benefit from a harvest of approaches than is writing instruction. In L2 classrooms, advanced composition is practiced at a point when instrumentally motivated students have likely been replaced by integratively motivated students; as such, they are assumed prepared (cognitively and affectively) to accept the premise of serious composition. At this stage of acquisition, learners are expected to absorb yet another linguistic medium to be codified—one which, in truth, often represents an insurmountable task for many native writers. *The Writing Process* is then evaluated with special scrutiny given to the success with which its vernacular and content do not become myopic, strained, or inappropriate to the target population.

Over the last several decades (arguably since the invention of the term "rhetoric"), a great deal of homage has been paid to writing as a *process*—not as an ordered and linear regurgitation of ideas into

traditional formulas and then onto paper. In short, the process method of writing calls for a paradigm in which student invention and instructor intervention are carefully interwoven. Process rhetoric encourages such approaches as brainstorming, prewriting, thought incubation, collaborative revision, expository drafting, and an awareness of audience-as-purpose in composing. The term "process" itself implies rigor and repetition of effort.

The Writing Process represents a near restatement of the process method paradigm. In keeping with her premise that high-intermediate L2 students should assume primary responsibility for their own acquisition of writing skills, the author presents workbook modules in the form of distinct (topic supplied) projects to be attempted during a term of average length. She notes that these modules are interchangeable depending on class design and purpose. Each section follows a consistent format in order to provide graduated composition tasks for the L2 student: Getting Ideas, Putting Ideas Together, Drafting, Getting Feedback, Editing, and Follow-up. These sections are designed to both enlarge and compartmentalize specific writing topics. In this sense, groups which have as their purpose scientific writing can concentrate on modules that promote gathering research data and adopting an empirical tone. If creative writing is the stated goal of the class, the writing of short stories, poetry and plays can be encouraged. For each topic, the step-by-step approach offered in *The Writing Process* encourages sustained text production.

Of great importance to any writing instructor is the degree to which subject matter is "appropriate to the interests of the learners for whom the textbook is intended" (Daoud and Celce-Murcia 1979). One must also be concerned with the nature of vocabulary and syntax that students will discover in the text. Is the workbook reasonable for the entire class? Does the text allow for sequential acquisition of elements from simple to complex? And, perhaps centrally, does it describe and inform each "mode" of written discourse? These modes, or aims, of discourse have been described as either expressive, persuasive, referential, or literary (Kinneavy 1971). While some degree of overlap should be anticipated for each category, *The Writing Process* relies heavily on referential (scientific or informative) topics. Expressive or literary themes are virtually unrepresented, leading one to conclude that the author has passed on tasks which allow maturing L2 students to compose freely, pursuant to their self-concept as writers. Of the twenty

available modules, twelve involve empirical, research-based activities, while only two can be defined as expressive or literary.

An additional deficiency is the quality of module topics chosen for the target audience. Clearly, the textbook attempts to lead its nonnative audience into mainstream North American regimens. Whether these "pizza and tennis shoes" themes are appropriate or attend to matters of relevance in the students lives will depend mainly on what types of learners populate a given L2 classroom and whether that classroom is located in an urban, suburban, or rural setting. This textbook implies an urban setting, wherein the target culture might recognize and routinely consider such issues as campus living, a new television series, and what to do should one suddenly find himself endowed with a sizeable fortune.

Adult L2 writing programs are most successful when (1) topic assignments match the students' own schemata, cultural background, and world experience (Petereson 1982), (2) topic assignments, such as project approaches to business and social understanding, are adapted to the student's age, surroundings, and aspirations (Boyd and Kenefick 1988), and, (3) students are given the opportunity to provide some situational input on writing projects. Is it thus inadvisable to pre-select themes for students to write about? Assuming L2 classrooms will vary greatly in profile, the topics available in *The Writing Process* are valuable more so in terms of how the author encourages and allows development of abstract ideas than that of their relative interest value. The point-albeit not innovatively demonstrated in the sample topics supplied-is that producing communicative text is a complicated, but reliable process that can be mastered with practice and meaningful, culturally broad contexts for exploration in the classroom.

My final exception to the text concerns the concept of a workbook-based curriculum in general, and the roles of the writing instructor and grammar text in particular. If the instructor is indeed a facilitator, his or her role cannot be limited to follow-up or incidental intervention. I suggest that writing teachers must be intuitively active in a classroom where workbooks and peer interaction/review are utilized. The test of a competent, involved instructor is the extent to which students are motivated or inhibited by such presence.

I recommend *The Writing Process* as a supplementary textbook to an advanced composition program for nonnative language writing students. Text organization is exceptional, inasmuch as the format allows for an optimal amount of writing activities both in and

outside of classroom settings. Task parameters, vocabulary, and excersises are appropriate for students who are motivated to write purposefully in the English language. At the same time, there exists a noted imbalance as to the types of writing required; I recommend students at this level be given the opportunity to volunteer project topics, and that such topics align evenly with their experience and eventual aspirations.

The Writing Process succeeds in promoting and ably demonstrating sensible, practical use of the process method of writing. I believe that the text will make its strongest contribution alongside a text(s) which offers a more rounded linguistic syllabus. This combination might, in fact, prove a desirable hedge against the needs personified by those who learn English as a second language and, in doing so, put a pencil to paper.

REFERENCES

- Bowen, J.D. et al. (1985). *TESOL Techniques and Procedures*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Boyd, F. & J. Kenefick (1988). *A project approach to teaching English for business purposes*. Paper presented at the 22nd Annual TESOL Convention, Chicago.
- Daoud A. & M. Celece-Murcia (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. In Celece-Murcia, M. and L. Macintosh. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kinneavy, J.L. (1971). *A Theory of Discourse*. New York: Norton.
- Peterson, B.T. (1982). Writing about responses: a unified model of reading, interpretation, and composition. *College English*. 44: 459-468.

DAVID J. EDWARDS

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

TPFLE, a refereed journal, encourages submission of previously unpublished articles on pedagogical and theoretical issues relating to foreign language education, teaching of English as a foreign/second language, and applied linguistics. Reports of ongoing research are welcome.

Manuscripts should be clearly type/computer written, and no more than 20 double-spaced pages in length. Authors should include a separate page with the complete title of the paper, the author's name, address, and phone number. The authors' name should not appear elsewhere in the text. Manuscripts printed on the Macintosh system are strongly encouraged.

References and footnotes : In the text, references are cited using the author's last name and publication date. If quotations are cited, these should additionally have page numbers (Wilkins 1976: 22). The reference list should be arranged in alphabetical order following the style sheet of *The American Psychological Association* and should appear on a separate page at the end of the article. (The *TESOL Quarterly* uses this format.)

As far as possible, comments and references should be incorporated into the text; footnotes should be set off from the text with a horizontal line.

Tables and graphs: Certain numerical tables can be typed. Other types of material (figures, illustrations, tables involving non-horizontal marks or special symbols) cannot, and must be submitted as camera ready.

The Editors of **TPFLE** reserve the right to make editorial changes in any manuscript accepted for publication.

Manuscripts submitted to **TPFLE** cannot be returned to authors.

Deadline for submissions to the Fall 1988 issue: September 30, 1988. Please submit two copies of your manuscript to

Editors, **TPFLE**
Education Building 528
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin TX 78712-1295

***TPFLE* and the FLEC Journal Committee**

TPFLE, published bi-annually by the FLEC Journal Committee, is devoted to the promotion of pedagogical and theoretical issues relating to Foreign Language Education, Teaching of English as a Foreign/Second Language, and Applied Linguistics.

The FLEC Journal Committee, formed in January 1988, consists of three faculty and eight student members from FLEC. The founder members of the committee are listed in the inside front cover of this issue. All students, faculty, and graduates of FLEC are eligible for membership in the committee.

The annual membership to *TPFLE* is \$9.00, inclusive of postage. Please address all inquiries to:

TPFLE
Education Building 528
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin TX 78712-1295

Make your checks payable to the "University of Texas at Austin"

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 1

Number 2

Fall, 1988

DAVID G. BOWIE & DIANE L. SCHALLERT Processes involved in composing a narration in a first and a second language

PATRICIA KILROE Making grammar explicit in the classroom: An illustration using the Spanish subjunctive

GEORGE BRAINE Academic writing task surveys: The need for a fresh approach

SAMUEL SMITH The second language acquisition process in immersion contexts: Theory and research

MICHELE MORAGNE e SILVA A study of composing in a first and a second language

MARK ALFINO on *How is Language Possible ?*

SURESH CANAGARAJAH on *The Social Construction of Literacy*

ERIC S. DWYER on *Frontiers: An Active Introduction to English Grammar*

Foreign Language Education Center

The University of Texas at Austin

**Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education
(TPFLE)**

Editors: Victoria Cobb and Suresh Canagarajah

FLEC Journal Committee

Elaine Horwitz, Faculty Adviser
Gareth Morgan, Faculty Adviser
George Braine
Suresh Canagarajah
Victoria Cobb
David Edwards
William Matta
Elizabeth Mitchell
Nae Dong Yang

TPFLE is the official journal of the Foreign Language Education
Center (FLEC) of The University of Texas at Austin.

Publication of TPFLE has been made possible by a grant from the
RGK Foundation of Austin, Texas.

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 1

Number 2

Fall, 1988

Articles

- 70 DAVID G. BOWIE & DIANE L. SCHALLERT Processes involved in composing a narration in a first and a second language
- 90 PATRICIA KILROE Making grammar explicit in the classroom: An illustration using the Spanish subjunctive
- 101 GEORGE BRAINE Academic writing task surveys: The need for a fresh approach
- 119 SAMUEL SMITH The second language acquisition process in immersion contexts: Theory and research
- 132 MICHELE MORAGNE e SILVA A study of composing in a first and a second language

Reviews

- 152 MARK ALFINO on *How is Language Possible ?*
- 157 SURESH CANAGARAJAH on *The Social Construction of Literacy*
- 162 ERIC S. DWYER on *Frontiers: An Active Introduction to English Grammar*
-

Contributors

DAVID G. BOWIE received his doctorate in Foreign Language Education in 1987. He teaches Early Childhood Language Acquisition at The University of Texas at Austin and ESL for the CARITAS program. His research interests are in psycholinguistics and adult language acquisition.

DIANE L. SCHALLERT is Associate Professor of Educational Psychology at The University of Texas at Austin and editor of *Reading Research Quarterly*. Her research interests are in comprehension and writing.

PATRICIA KILROE is a doctoral student in the Department of French and Italian at the University of Texas at Austin.

GEORGE BRAINE, a doctoral student in TEFL, teaches Freshman English at The University of Texas at Austin. He has also taught English in Sri Lanka and Oman. His research area is needs analysis.

SAMUEL SMITH is a doctoral student in Foreign Language Education, specializing in English and Russian. He teaches scientific and technical Russian in the Department of Slavic Languages at the University of Texas at Austin.

MICHELE MORAGNE e SILVA is Assistant Professor of English and Director of ESL writing courses at St. Edward's University, Austin. She is a doctoral student in Applied Linguistics.

MARK ALFINO is a doctoral student in Philosophy at The University of Texas at Austin.

SURESH CANAGARAJAH, a doctoral student in Applied Linguistics, teaches English literature to foreign students at The University of Texas at Austin.

ERIC S. DWYER is a graduate student in Foreign Language Education at The University of Texas at Austin. He is focusing his studies on grammatical and musical aspects of the ESL classroom.

Processes Involved in Composing a Narration in a First and a Second Language

DAVID G. BOWIE & DIANE L. SCHALLERT

What processes are involved when someone is struggling to compose a story? Is a description of these processes as they occur in a first language generally adequate in describing the same task now performed in a second language? These questions point to an issue that researchers in writing have been struggling with and that was most clearly outlined in a paper by McCutchen (1984). There, she argued that current composition research had over-emphasized the problem solving and planning aspects of writing at the expense of considering its linguistic aspect. By linguistic aspect, McCutchen was referring to the special constraints that influence the writer as soon as he or she begins to put actual words to ideas. The linear nature of language, the constraints placed upon the writer by attempts to maintain coherence, grammaticality, and topic focus, the recursive effect on thinking of words the writer lights upon, all influence the writing process in immediate and powerful ways. McCutchen's ideas seemed particularly relevant when considering the composing process in a second language. People proficient in all the language modes in their first language may have difficulty composing in a second language, not because they cannot plan their writing and construct a meaning they want to communicate, but because they encounter difficulties at the local, or surface, or word level. Such composers might prove particularly useful in revealing strategies for converting thought to language because the process should be more effortful and thus more easily observed in them.

To pursue this objective, we chose an oral narration task, asking bilingual speakers to narrate the storylines for wordless, picture stories. Oral narration was chosen because it gives participants the same linguistic and conceptual composition task as written narration without imposing the constraints that the written code in a second language may have. We wanted our subjects to be concerned about what their story was and how they were expressing it in words, but not to be worried about spelling conventions. Specifically, we videotaped 12 participants telling one story in Portuguese (L1) and telling another in English (L2). After each story, participants were asked to share out loud any thoughts they remembered experiencing during their storytelling. Our methodology was guided by the

narrative studies of Polanyi (1982) and Tannen (1984), and by the think-aloud studies of Flower and Hayes (1984; Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver, & Stratmen, 1986) and retrospective interviews of Odell and Goswami (1984) on the writing process. The emphasis throughout was on the cognitive processes involved in spontaneous oral narration. The retrospective think-aloud commentary, together with the narrative data, furnished the primary data which we transcribed and analyzed for evidence of the mental processes involved in putting language to thought.

We began data analysis, following the guidelines of qualitative analysis (cf. Miles & Huberman, 1984; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), with some very general expectations of what we would find. We then refined categories from several "passes" through the data and, in a fuller report of these data, we present four major categories of conclusions which we felt were best supported by what our participants had revealed and by the existing literature on the process of composition. In this report, we concentrate on the one of these propositions, the central problem delineated by McCutchen (1984) involved in the lexicalization process. In the sections that follow, we will first provide a flavor of the general theoretical framework that we brought to the study. We will then describe in greater detail our methodology. As we report the details of data analysis, we will return to the literature on narration and composition to describe more fully the lexicalization process as we saw it supported by the data and by previous work in this area. Finally, we will conclude by summarizing our findings and drawing some implications for research on the connection between thought and language and for second language instruction.

A General Perspective on Written Composition and Oral Narration

Our approach in this study was premised on the belief that reading, writing, speaking, and listening all involve active language processing and creative construction. The "mental machinery" involved in writing and speaking (and indeed reading and listening) must share more similarities than differences. While operating through different outward modes, writers and speakers can only communicate with the tacit agreement and active contribution of readers and listeners, who actively reconstruct incoming messages (Nystrand, 1982; Tierney & Pearson, 1983). Similarly, writers and speakers actively interpret what they want to say or write to arrive at

a meaning they can express in words. The following propositions, taken from Schallert (1987, pp. 65-66), provide more details of the general perspective we held as we began the study:

1. Reading is an activity that involves the coordination of interactive perceptual and cognitive processes, sharing the resources of a limited-capacity processor, with the goal of making sense of a message (e.g., Lesgold & Perfetti, 1981; Roser & Schallert, 1983; Stanovich, 1986).

2. Reading comprehension in particular is a meaning-making activity, a purposeful process by which a reader takes the print as clues for reconstructing the author's message. Included in this view is the reader's apprehension of not only the sense but also the significance of the message (e.g., Anderson, 1984; Roser & Schallert, 1983; Tierney & Pearson, 1983).

3. Writing is on the one hand the reverse of reading--i.e., a process by which an author makes ideas explicit and renders these into text form--and, on the other hand, the same as reading--involving as it does the construction of meaning influenced by existing knowledge and salient goals for communication (e.g., Eckhoff, 1983; Nystrand, 1982; Squire, 1983; Tierney & Pearson, 1983).

4. For both reading and writing, theorists have been most interested in describing the underlying processes involved--exactly how we coordinate the subprocesses and respond to the constraints inherent in meaning making (e.g., Flower & Hayes, 1984; Just & Carpenter, 1984; Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; McCutchen, 1984; Scardamalia, Bereiter, & Goelman, 1982).

5. The above interest has accompanied a new view of text. Texts are no longer taken as having single, stable, correct meanings. Nor is the term *text* reserved only for external realizations of language extending beyond a sentence in length. Instead, *text* refers to language in use, printed or spoken, by an author with an authentic purpose. Texts can be of any length ranging from single words to whole volumes (e.g., Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981; Nystrand, 1982).

6. Reading and writing, like other communication acts, are influenced profoundly by the social situation in which they occur. Thus, context, purpose, task, social functions are all relevant sources of variables that will determine how compositions and comprehension proceed and what form of text results (e.g., Bransford, 1979; Faigley, 1986; Odell & Goswami, 1984; Schallert, Alexander, & Goetz, 1985).

The above points reflect our general beliefs about reading and writing as representative of two of the language modes. We were also influenced to a lesser degree by the literature on oral narration. In that literature, oral narration is portrayed as an important language ability, a natural part of human experience from early childhood on (cf. Eisenberg, 1985; Labov, 1972; Fakhri, 1984; Gee, 1985). The storyteller must create everything in a story: vocabulary, syntax, complication, resolution, emphasis, attitudes, and evaluation. Successful narration involves "taking the floor" for extended periods of explanation or narration to one or more persons. It is seen as requiring creative interpretation, construction, and language synthesis, one of the highest levels of thinking. Thus, both written and oral narration are portrayed in the literature as interactive language skills that draw on common language processes simultaneously.

Yet, compared to writing, the actual process of oral narration has been relatively unexamined. The technical and logistic problems involved in recording and transcribing oral speech data are partly to blame. For us, attempting to use a methodology widely used in written composition research, we faced the problem that the very nature of speaking--the vocal cords already engaged--precludes simultaneous thinking "out loud." As a solution, we designed a method of videotaping the narration, and then showing it back to the participants to aid them in recalling their thinking. Participants were encouraged to pause the playback in order to share out loud any thoughts remembered whenever possible. Everything depended on their ability to recall and vocalize narrative thoughts as accurately as possible. We hoped that by witnessing their stories as audience, participants would more easily recall their thinking.

As a research tool, think-aloud data depend on the subjective report of the research subject and have been vigorously criticized for introducing bias and altering the very phenomenon being observed (Tomlinson, 1984). However, if interpreted with some caution, such self-reporting can be quite useful (Ericsson and Simon, 1984; Sternglass, & Pugh, 1986).

METHOD

Participants

Twelve Brazilians--6 women and 6 men--agreed to participate in the study. Coming from various geographic regions of Brazil, they included five college students, two housewives, two physicians, and three other professionals. Participants had to be at least 20 years old, be competent in their native language, and possess intermediate to advanced ESL (English as a Second Language) fluency. None of them were previously acquainted with us. Most were recruited by phone, one of us explaining the project to them in Portuguese. Participants received no financial compensation, but were later given a copy of their transcribed stories.

Story Materials

To elicit narrative speech, we chose three published, wordless, picture stories, written for young children. Characteristic of such stories is their clear, engaging storyline expressed solely through pictures. "Readers" must create their own meaning for the story and often cannot help but put the story into words. In this sense, they are comparable to Chafe's (1980) and Tomlin's (1984, 1985) silent films and Dechert's (1983) short series of illustrations to elicit spoken language, or Váradi's (1983) series of drawings to elicit written language. Our procedure allowed participants to tell stories in their own words, but within controlled parameters of theme, topic, and sequence. Figure 1 presents the first eight frames from the practice story.

Each participant first carried out the entire narration and think-aloud procedure on a practice story. This story, called *Hiccup*, written by Mercer Mayer, was told half in Portuguese and half in English. Participants then told the two main stories, *Frog Goes to Dinner*, by Mercer Mayer (22 pages), and *The Silver Pony*, by Lynd Ward (23 pages, abridged). *Frog Goes to Dinner* is a humorous farce about a family's pet frog getting loose in a fancy restaurant and causing a disturbance. *The Silver Pony* is a mystical, adventure story about a young boy flying on a silver pegasus around the world. Referred to hereafter as the frog and pegasus stories, the two were counterbalanced in terms of order of telling. All participants told the first story (either frog or pegasus) in Portuguese

and the second in English. Each story was told an equal number of times in both languages.



FIGURE 1

Example of a wordless picture story. These Eight frames are taken from the beginning of the practice story entitled *Hiccup*.

Procedure

To establish a natural and relaxed setting, we had participants tell the stories while seated in a comfortable arm chair in a living room, across from one of the researchers. A color video camera unobtrusively sat across the room, and a small television monitor was on a side table near the participant. Think-aloud material was audio-recorded with the same clip-on lapel microphone used for the audio portion of the videotaping.

One of us had prerecorded the directions on videotape in Portuguese for showing to each participant, this to guarantee

uniform treatment, increase familiarity with the videotape format, and establish Portuguese as a viable language that could be understood. A written version of the directions was also made available to participants. The following are some key points made in the directions:

1. To think of the tasks in the experiment not as tests, but challenges.
2. To become the "author, creator, or painter" of the stories, and tell them in whatever way seems sensible, as one might tell a story to friends or children.
3. To include as much detail as seems necessary and not worry about language mistakes made in the telling, since everyone makes mistakes.
4. While viewing the playback of each story, to pause it as often as necessary to recall thoughts experienced during its telling, "moment by moment, phrase by phrase, word by word."

The directions suggested to each participant "look at your face and study the way you talked on the playback. . . . What might have caused you to laugh, move your head, or raise your eyebrows, etc.?"

Participants were allowed time to look over each of the story booklets before videotaping began and to ask any procedural or vocabulary questions. When ready, each began his or her narration by pressing the remote button to start the camera, knowing that the story must be told in its entirety without stopping the recording.

Immediately following each narration, the researcher rewound the videotape and showed its replay. While viewing it, participants attempted to recall aloud any thoughts remembered during the narration, pausing or backing up the playback for a second look whenever necessary. If a participant was silent for long periods during the playback, the researcher asked if he or she could remember anything. The think-aloud task thus resembled an interview, since the researcher both questioned and responded to participants' queries in attempting to aid the think-aloud process.

The combined narrative and think-aloud tasks took between 35 minutes and an hour for each story, with a short break between

stories. After the last story, participants completed a short biographical questionnaire.

Data Transcription

We transcribed to written form the narrations and more than 20 hours total of oral think-aloud material. We adopted a number of notational conventions to delineate think-alouds from narrations. All spoken Portuguese was translated to English prior to transcription. Portuguese remained only when it was the topic, always followed by its English translation. English occurring within Portuguese narrative context and throughout the think-aloud material was bold-faced to differentiate it from translated Portuguese. The English narrations were not bold-faced, since they were composed in English. Portuguese occurring within English narrative context was put between quote marks, followed by the English translation. We also included markings for temporal hesitation phenomena, such as laughter and the filled pauses "ahh" and "umm." Unfilled pauses were indicated by ellipses, e.g., "...", "... ." or "...".

The transcriptions were checked several times for accuracy, and several participants were contacted for clarification. A native Portuguese speaking consultant verified all Portuguese words, phrases, and punctuation in the transcripts. (See Bowie, 1987, pp. 209-362, for the complete transcripts.)

Data Analysis

Although our initial focus was on the lexicalization process in composition, we saw immediately that the data would yield insights into broader aspects. Specifically, we found that our participants commented on aspects of their experience that were related to well-established phenomena in the composition literature. What McCutchen (1984) and Flower & Hayes (1984) had commented on, the need to pay attention to both the planning/problem-solving/knowledge-based aspect and the language-based aspect, became clear as we began our analysis. We eventually settled on four broad categories of comments, three of which made connection with the planning/knowledge literature and one of which pertained directly to our focal interest in the lexicalization process. Below, we present brief descriptions of three of the categories, categories that in

this paper we do not attempt to exemplify further. The fourth category is our focus here.

Prior Knowledge. The first proposition states that prior knowledge influences language processing, both productive and receptive, and that this prior knowledge is unique for each person and situation (c.f., Anderson, Reynolds, Schallert, & Goetz, 1977; Hayes & Flower, 1980, 1983; Schallert, 1982, 1987). In terms of our participants, prior knowledge came into play as they interpreted the wordless stories, making sense of them in terms of knowledge they could bring to bear in constructing meaning. Then, as they told their stories, our participants had to contend not only with the current meaning they were constructing on a second look at the picture books but also with their memory for their first interpretation and for the developing story made public and permanent on the videotape.

Information Processing Constraints. The second proposition states that there are demands put on language users by information processing constraints (c.f., Chafe, 1980; Matsuhashi, 1981; Stanovich, 1981, 1986; Scardamalia, 1981; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1984). The perceived complexity of reality fluctuates in everyday experience, with greater complexity requiring more exertion of thought and a concomitant higher cognitive processing demand. When demand threatens to exceed capacity, consolidation, prioritizing, simplification, or sometimes loss of one's train of thought (comparable to a computer "crash") may occur. Thus for our participants, we found many occasions when the sheer load of attempting to do more than one can successfully manage was evident.

Audience Awareness and Textual Space. Our third proposition states that language processing reflects pervasive concerns with real and/or imagined audiences (c.f., Nystrand, 1982). As a social activity, the participation of both sender and receiver presupposes an awareness in each of the other. Both writers and speakers tailor what they say or write to perceived expectations of their reader or listener. When successful, communication is experienced as effortless and the focus is on ideas and intentions, not on the words. For our participants, this was exhibited in a number of ways. There were some obvious accommodations made to particular audiences as well as occasions

when the narrators became confused or broke through the storytelling frame and addressed the researcher directly.

Linguistic Constraints. The fourth proposition states that linguistic constraints influence language processing, much as do information processing constraints (c. f., Kaufer, Hayes, & Flower, 1986; McCutchen, 1984). Language users must conform to certain linguistic conventions in order to be understood, conventions such as maintaining proper focus by using the correct given/new contrasts, achieving cohesion, choosing words that have the right level of novelty and the right kind of connotations and yet, at the same, are clear in expressing what one wants to say. Awareness of the need to follow such conventions places strong demands on the cognitive apparatus. McCutchen has written that "on-line" writing involves at some point committing thought to the linear form of a sentence, with all the uncertainties pertinent to where the sentence will end up. Speakers must similarly achieve this linearity, but with the additional disadvantage that revision is often more difficult in speaking than in writing. In the next section, we explore this proposition in detail and provide examples of supporting data, after some preliminary information describing the participants' overall performance.

RESULTS

Participants were generally most willing to tell stories and talk about their mental processes. Occasional reticence may have been partly due to their interest in viewing themselves and their narrative creation on videotape. Being videotaped was a new experience for all but one.

As mentioned previously, the stories were counterbalanced for language, resulting in each story having 6 Portuguese versions and 6 English versions, half told by women and half told by men. Elapsed narrative times ranged from 2:57 to 11:15, averaging just over 8 minutes. Stories averaged 892 words, 18.1 words per page in Portuguese, and 17.5 words per page in English. Participants not surprisingly spoke a little slower in English than in their native Portuguese. However, since all data were mutually exclusive (that is, no person told the same story in both languages), quantitative comparisons by language were not possible. Most were quite adept in either Portuguese or English storytelling and thinking aloud.

Participants produced 489 total retrospective think-alouds. With 116 think-alouds culled out because they were after-the-fact corrections, questions to the researcher, or continuations of previous think alouds, there remained a total of 373 novel and significant think-alouds, or 15.5 per story. (See Bowie, 1987, pp. 71-92, for additional quantitative results.)

In the section that follows, we provide examples from narrations and think-aloud commentaries that pertain to the linguistic constraint proposition. All names of the participants have been changed to protect their privacy. Note that it was not at all unusual for an example to depict more than one of the propositions described above. In choosing particular examples for this report, we are emphasizing a particular perspective on each excerpt, aware of others that could be taken.

Linguistic Constraints

Influenced by McCutchen (1984), this proposition states that writers (and speakers) are involved in the uncertain and unpredictable world of linear sentence generation and "text-level processes." With revision less available in extemporaneous speaking than in writing, and with the added burden of having to speak in a second language, narrators in this study frequently experienced difficulties in producing sentences. Nowhere was this more evident than in Carlos' admission of inadequate sentence building in the frog story:

Think-aloud (p. 10) I was not satisfied with the construction of the particular sentence. I . . . I . . . wanted to say this: "with the consternation that went on throughout the restaurant." . . . And I could never get that . . . built . . . that created . . . And that messed me up.

Lexical uncertainty was manifest in both English and Portuguese narrative data. Marta, for example, translated "**barn**" to "cocheira" in the Portuguese pegasus story (p. 14.) She consciously doubted her accuracy, agreeing that "corral" might have worked better, but missed the Portuguese translation of the English "hayloft" to "palheiro," and "barn" to "celeiro." Both Luiz

and Carlos admitted that in certain instances they translated from English to Portuguese.

All participants to various degrees strove to achieve lexical variety by avoiding the repetition of a word or phrase. Ana, for example, was dissatisfied with the choice of "surpreso" ["surprise"] to describe the boy sleeping outside his house in the pegasus story:

Narration (p. 20) Pedrinho, to his surprise, was sleeping on . . . on the grass.

Think-aloud I don't know why I put in the word "surpreso." Because if he is sleeping, he couldn't have surprise. He could be surprised only after he woke up. . . . I don't know. This word came, and I don't know why. Perhaps because I had used it before. . . . And I left it. . . . I wasn't going to correct it.

In addition to variety, Carlos sought to distinguish his narrations with aesthetic language:

Think-aloud (p. 5) Here I was trying to get away from the expression "cavalo voador" ["flying horse"] . . . "cavalo alado" ["winged horse"] is a good word but too awfully . . . snobby. . . . And "cavalo voador," . . . too common.

Occasionally, synonyms vied equally for narrative attention, such as when Liza was undecided between "levantar" ["get up"] and "acordar" ["wake up"] in the pegasus story (p. 2). Paulo was similarly undecided in the pegasus story between describing the boy's parents as "os seus pais" ["his parents"] and "o seu pai e sua mãe" ["his father and his mother"], and continued to struggle with the choice as he told the story (pp. 2, 10, 20).

Another difficulty emerged when participants were unsuccessful in finding the correct and corresponding translation of a word from one language to another. For example, Carlos claimed his incorrect Portuguese "alimentar as galinhas" ["feed the chickens"] in the pegasus story was caused by direct translation from English (p. 2).

Finally, there were many instances where participants made word-level choices that resulted in particularly well-told narrations. For example, near the end of the story, Marta compared the small, real horse with the pegasus, using the same adjectives to describe it as she had used earlier to describe the pegasus (p. 5):

Narration (p. 22) And the horse was still small. But he was elegant and beautiful. He was a friend to Francisco.

Think-aloud "Imponente" is "elegant." "Elegant," "imponente." And at the time that I was describing this little horse, I was making a comparison. He looked very much like the horse of his imagination.

Liza expressed satisfaction with her metaphor, "fruta da imaginação" [fruit of the imagination] in the pegasus story:

Narration (p. 12) Then the boy decided to return to the . . . to the foot of the apple tree, and he started picking apples. And suddenly the horse appears again. And he dropped the whole basket of apples to the ground, and very happily looked at the horse. Because he knew that it was not just . . . fruit of his imagination.

Think-aloud There was a combination there, "fruit of the imagination," "creation of his mind," right? The "fruit of his imagination" is the product of his mind. Do you understand?

R: Was this spontaneous?

Liza: It was spontaneous. It was . . . it was spontaneous language creation. Really it, it was a . . . a, a natural creation that suggested itself, that . . . that fit with the . . . with the . . . with the word "apple." It was "fruit" that he was picking. Very often, perhaps . . . the poet, when . . . when working on a work of art, I believe the word comes naturally and fits with the rhyme.

Carlos invented two new play-on-words in the frog story; one was pre-planned, one was not:

Narration (p. 1) And [Mr. Green] has some sort of "in" with Johnny. For instance, he can get "in" places wh-- . . . where Johnny . . . ahh . . . might let him stay, like Johnny's coat pocket.

Think-Aloud

R: Was this planned?, "In," "in?"

Carlos: No. It was spontaneous. [laughing]

Narration (p., 6) And as the saxophone sounded different, the drummer said to the saxophone player, "If I did not know better, I would say you have a frog in your throat, I mean in your saxophone."

Think-Aloud

Carlos: [laughing] **That one I had thought up. That was quite . . .** [laughing] **But I . . .** [laughing]

These examples lend strong support to the proposition that all language users encounter "on-line" linguistic constraints at the local level in their sentence production, and that these constraints occasionally interfere with previous narrative plans made at a more global level. Liza described the exigencies of lexical choice with the metaphor of words flowing like water, or like luggage at an airport baggage claim:

Think-Aloud (p. 18) I see another crossing of words, words flowing like this, rapidly, the words. . . . In other words, it's so quickly appearing like that, those waters that come like that, those words that are flowing. Pick one to be able to pick another. [laughing] Which one do you take first? Because they are in a line. It's like when you leave the airport with your bags. And you are waiting for your luggage. And that line comes. And then you are taking them. How will you do this? . . . Passing. And you will take one. Right? And you . . . you have huge numbers of words there. Many. And you're going to take one.

CONCLUSION

Language use is a conscious, active process, and its processes are to varying degrees self-reportable by the user. We found that the narratives composed by our participants, as well as their self-reported think-alouds, contained valid and convincing examples of what McCutchen had described as the lexicalization problem. Participants experienced the on-line demands of producing correct language in circumstances that they did not fully control. Having made plans in advance for certain narrative content frequently proved insufficient at some point during actual storytelling. Converting unexpected thoughts into understandable language output required spontaneous language production, using linear, non-hierarchical methods of sentence generation. Regardless of the degree to which content had been chosen, linguistic constraints impinged on the spoken output of all narrators in the same fashion as McCutchen (1984) argued takes place for writers: "sometimes to a preplanned next idea, sometimes to a newly discovered thought,

and sometimes to a dead end" (p. 228). Repeated examples of successful and unsuccessful lexical searches, avoidance of certain words and structures, intrusions of Portuguese into English and vice versa, efforts to use descriptive variety and poetic structures, and even serendipitous new discoveries (such as Liza's spontaneous "fruta da imaginação" metaphor) emerged in abundance from narrative and think-aloud tasks, strongly substantiating the claim that linguistic constraints influence the composing of oral narratives.

Although we did not report on them at great length in this paper, we did find clear evidence for the other three propositions described above. For example, with regards to the prior knowledge proposition, we found that our participants had to construct an understanding of the wordless picture stories consistent with their existing knowledge regarding rural life, frogs, restaurants, parent-child relationships, and so forth. Secondly, they were clearly subject to information processing constraints. We saw many instances where they had to manage their storytelling so as not to exceed processing capacity and where they showed awareness of options that were considered but not taken, this in order to "keep on track." In both L1 and L2 storytelling, participants continually strove to maintain a balance between the management of grammatical, ideational, memory, and time concerns. Finally, participants were to various degrees all aware of audience during their storytelling.

That the processes represented in these propositions frequently overlapped each other--as for example, linguistic constraints and information processing constraints--should not be surprising. For example, Liza's "fruta da imaginação" metaphor and Carlos' "frog in your throat, I mean in your saxophone" play on words, previously mentioned as supporting the linguistic constraint proposition, also lend support to the information processing proposition, as well as to our view of active language composing. Form and meaning in language use nearly always go hand in hand.

As we had expected, collecting both L1 and L2 narrative and think-aloud data proved fruitful to our research, since L2 language use was indeed more effortful, and therefore useful in providing a description of what takes place during oral composition. As previously mentioned, for any one participant, the data were mutually exclusive and we could not directly compare an individual's Portuguese and English narrations on the same material. Nevertheless, our data did not point to radically different processes in L2 composing. Hints of differences were more in terms of degree than of kind. For example, participants seemed more

concerned with choosing the correct word or grammatical forms when narrating in their less dominant language whereas they seemed more able to pay attention to the story as a whole when telling a story in their dominant language. However, there were many examples of word-level concerns in L1 composing and many admirable feats of story creation in L2 composing. We were generally much more struck by the similarities in composing processes evidenced in both language situations than by any clear differences.

As for implications for language teaching, we agree with one of our participants that wordless story books should be used in L2 teaching. The use of pictures is, of course, not a new idea in language teaching, but certainly one that has not been sufficiently exploited to date. We feel its use is potentially an excellent one, since individual language creativity would be encouraged, and in fact demanded from such activity. Wordless picture books are widely available in the children's book stores and sections of most libraries, and are frequently just as appealing to adults.

In conclusion, we believe that the active meaning construction viewpoint for all language use is well supported by this study's findings. Throughout the planning, narration, and retrospective portions, the experiment required an abundance of mental activity. More than one participant commented that they were exhausted from the mental effort required and one commented that he had worked up a considerable appetite. No language use can be passive.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. C. (1984). Role of the reader's schema in comprehension, learning, and memory. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and content texts*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Anderson, R. C., Reynolds, R. E., Schallert, D. L., & Goetz, E. T. (1977). Frameworks for comprehending discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, 14, 367-381.
- Beaugrande, R. de, & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1984). Information-processing demand of text composition. In N. Stein & T. Trabasso (Eds.),

- Learning and comprehension of text*, pp. 407-428. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bowie, D. G. (1987). Converting thought to oral narrative composition in a second language. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Texas at Austin.
- Bransford, J. D. (1979). *Human cognition: Learning, understanding, and remembering*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Chafe, W. L. (1980). The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative. In W. L. Chafe (Ed.), *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural and linguistic aspects of narrative production*, pp. 9-50. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Dechert, H. W. (1983). How a story is done in a second language. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication*, pp. 175-195. London: Longman.
- Eckhoff, B. (1983). How reading affects children's writing. *Language Arts*, 60, 607-616.
- Eisenberg, A. R. (1985). Learning to describe past experiences in conversation. *Discourse Processes*, 8, 177-204.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1984). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Faigley, L. S. (1986). Nonacademic writing: The social perspective. In L. Odell & D. Goswami (Eds.), *Writing in nonacademic settings*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Fakhri, A. (1984). The use of communicative strategies in narrative discourse: a case study of a learner of Moroccan Arabic as a second language. *Language Learning*, 34, 15-37.
- Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1984). Images, plans, and prose. *Written Communication*, 1, 120-160.
- Flower, L. S., Hayes, J. R., Carey, L., Schriver, K., & Stratman, J. (1986). Detection, diagnosis, and the strategies of revision. *College Composition and Communication*, 37, 16-55.
- Gee, J. P. (1985). The narrativization of experience in the oral style. *Journal of Education*, 167, 9-35.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing*, pp. 3-30. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1983). Uncovering cognitive processes in writing: An introduction to protocol analysis. In

- P. Mosenthal, L. Tamor, & S. Walmsley (Eds.), *Research in writing: Principles and methods*. New York: Longman, 207-220.
- Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1984). Reading skills and skilled reading in the comprehension of text. In H. Mandl, N. L. Stein, & T. Trabasso (Eds.), *Learning and comprehension of text*, pp. 307-329. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kaufert, D. S., Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1986). Composing written sentences. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 20, 121-140.
- Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85, 363-394.
- Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In *Language in the inner city*, pp. 354-396. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lesgold, A. M., & Perfetti, C. A. (Eds.) (1981). *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Matsushashi, A. (1981). Pausing and planning: The tempo of written discourse production. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 15, 113-134.
- Mayer, M. (1974) *Frog goes to dinner*. New York: Dial.
- Mayer, M. (1976) *Hiccup*. New York: Dial.
- McCutchen, D. (1984) Writing as a linguistic problem. *Educational Psychologist*, 19, 226-38.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Toward a shared craft. *Educational Researcher*, 13, 20-30.
- Nystrand, M. (1982) The structure of textual space. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *What writer's know: The language, process, and structure of written discourse*, pp. 75-86. New York: Academic Press.
- Odell, L., & Goswami, D. (1984). Writing in a nonacademic setting. In R. Beach & L. S. Bridwell (Eds.), *New directions in composition research*, pp. 233-258. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Polanyi, L. (1982). Literary complexity in everyday storytelling. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language exploring orality and literacy*, pp. 155-170. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Roser, N. & Schallert, D. L. (1983). Reading research: What it says to the school psychologist. In T. R. Kratochwill (Ed.),

- Advances in school psychology* (Vol. 3), pp. 237-268. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Scardamalia, M. (1981). How children cope with the cognitive demands of writing. In C. H. Frederiksen & J. F. Dominic (Eds.), *Writing: The nature, development, and teaching of written communication*, pp. 81-103. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1984). Development of strategies in text processing. In N. Stein & T. Trabasso (Eds.), *Learning and comprehension of text*, pp. 379-428. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C., & Goelman, H. (1982). The role of production factors in writing ability. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *What writer's know: The language, process, and structure of written discourse*, pp. 173-210. New York: Academic Press.
- Schallert, D. L. (1982). The significance of knowledge: A synthesis of research related to schema theory. In W. Otto & S. White (Eds.), *Reading expository material*, pp. 13-47. New York: Academic Press.
- Schallert, D. L. (1987). Thought and language, content and structure in language communication. In J. R. Squire (Ed.), *The dynamics of language learning: Research in reading and English*, pp. 65-79. Urbana, IL: National Conference on Research in English.
- Schallert, D. L., Alexander, P. A., & Goetz, E. T. (1985). What do instructors and authors do to influence the textbook-student relationship? In J. A. Niles & R. V. Lalik (Eds.), *Issues in literacy: A research Perspective*, pp. 110-115. Rochester, NY: The National Reading Conference, Inc.
- Squire, J. R. (1983). Composing and comprehending: Two sides of the same basic process. *Language Arts*, 60, 581-589.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1981). Attentional and automatic context effects in reading. In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*, pp. 241-268. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 360-406.
- Sternglass, M. S., & Pugh, S. L. (1986) Retrospective accounts of language and learning processes. *Written Communication*, 3, 297-323.

- Tannen, D. (1984) Narrative strategies. In *Conversational style: analyzing talk among friends*, pp. 97-129. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tierney, R. J., & Pearson, P. D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, 60, 568-580.
- Tomlin, R. S. (1984). The treatment of foreground-background information in the on-line descriptive discourse of second language learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, 115-142.
- Tomlin, R. S. (1985). Foreground-background information and the syntax of subordination. *Text*, 5, 85-122.
- Tomlinson, B. (1984). Talking about the composing process: The limitations of retrospective accounts. *Written Communication*, 1, 429-445.
- Váradi, T. (1983). Strategies of target language learner communication: Message adjustment. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication*, pp. 79-99. London: Longman.
- Ward, L. (1973). *The silver pony*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

*Making Grammar Explicit In The Classroom: An Illustration Using The Spanish Subjunctive*¹

PATRICIA KILROE

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to show how the use of explicit grammatical explanation can help students who are learning a foreign language. Specifically, I propose that the Spanish subjunctive can be more easily learned by native English-speaking students if the concept of the subjunctive is first made clear to these students.

An instructor's primary aim in teaching a foreign language is to see to it that students learn that language. From the perspective of that aim, instructors must routinely decide what approach is best for getting students to understand concepts which are both essential and common in the target language, but which students understand poorly in their native language. In the case of the subjunctive and the native English speaker, one choice open to instructors is to make explicit a concept which students, through usage, have mastered implicitly, but only implicitly.

The common pedagogical dictum that "the subjunctive has all but disappeared in English" in fact refers only to the morphology of the subjunctive. It is important to be aware that a language can lose a set of grammatical forms without losing the corresponding concept and the ability to express that concept. What this means for the language teacher is that it is important to understand exactly which grammatical structures have replaced the disappearing morphology.

By presenting what I will refer to as the English subjunctive before they present the Spanish subjunctive, I believe instructors can ease the task of students who are confronted with the Spanish subjunctive for the first time. My approach differs from the traditional textbook approach in that textbooks generally consider the target language only, restricting reference to English grammar to a minimum. I am suggesting that emphasis be placed for a short time on English, so that students might be given the opportunity to

¹An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Wisconsin Association of Foreign Language Teachers 1987 Conference in Madison, Wisconsin, October 1987.

recognize and understand the concept of the subjunctive in their native language. This will allow them to accept and apply it more readily in Spanish.

I propose that the idea of the subjunctive be made explicit by allowing students to discover, from sentence patterns, the various formal devices that English employs to express the subjunctive. While I am not advocating a return to the grammar-translation method of foreign language teaching in which explicit grammatical explanation is the focus of every lesson, I am suggesting that teachers may occasionally make use of explicit grammar to teach grammatical points that are traditionally difficult because they are alien or unclear to students in their native language. I am aware that this suggestion will probably be viewed as reactionary in relation to certain foreign language teaching theories holding sway at the present time. It can be noted, at any rate, that using explicit grammar to teach a grammatical point such as the subjunctive is completely compatible with the direct method, in which only the target language is used. There is no conflict between making grammar explicit and using the target language to do it.

In order to help students understand the subjunctive, an instructor can suggest to students, by means of sets of sample sentences, that there are several ways in which the subjunctive can be identified in English. I will discuss three of these ways here. The first I will refer to here as *morphological*; this type can be seen in the third-person singular verb form in a sentence such as "I insist that she be prompt." A second type I will refer to here as *syntactic*; this can be exemplified by the sentence "We want her to do it." And the third type consists of *formulaic* expressions such as "Be that as it may."

I will restrict my remarks to the semantic categories of volition, necessity, contrary-to-fact statements, emotion, and opinion, and to formulaic expressions, even though these do not exhaust the notions expressed by the subjunctive in Spanish. They are, however, major categories, and will serve as a foundation which could be extended by analogy. A practical note here: no more than fifteen minutes is needed to present the English subjunctive to a class.

The English Subjunctive

In the classroom, one might begin by introducing a set of English sentences which use the morphological subjunctive, and

asking students what they notice 1) about the third-person singular verb forms in the subordinate clauses, and 2) about the meaning of the main-clause verbs. A few possible sentences are given in (1) to (4) below:

- (1) I suggest that he do it now.
- (2) She demands that he (you) be here this evening.
- (3) We insist that she take it.
- (4) They request that she stay home.

The instructor might wish to present these sentences in the form of a transformation drill, so that the contrast between the complex sentences above and the corresponding simple sentences, in which the subordinate-clause verbs are in independent clauses, becomes readily apparent. For example, students are given the simple sentence, "He does it now." Then they are told to put this clause into a sentence which begins, "I suggest that..." and to make any necessary changes. They can therefore discover for themselves the resultant sentence: "I suggest that he do it now."

From the first set of sentences, students notice that the form of the verb in the subordinate clause is consistently different from the form of the same verb in the corresponding independent clause, that the difference lies in the fact that in the subordinate clauses, the infinitive of the verb without "to" is used, instead of the third person singular indicative, and that the verbs in the main clauses of the complex sentences all have a semantic feature in common: they all express volition.²

Next consider sentences (5) to (7) below:

- (5) If I were you, I'd stay.
- (6) I wish he were here.
- (7) She acts as if she were a queen bee.

These sentences are also examples of the use of the morphological subjunctive in English, but they are to be treated separately from the previous set of sentences because they express, not volition, but hypothetical or unreal meaning, that is, they are contrary-to-fact statements. But in addition to the semantic

² Of course some verbs that express volition, notably the verb "to want," do not fall into this morphological-subjunctive category. These will be treated presently, as part of the syntactic subjunctive.

difference between these sentences and the first set of sentences, (1) to (4), there are some formal differences: Sentences of this type almost always occur with the verb in the past tense, so that the morphology of the subjunctive is apparent only with the verb "to be," since all other English verbs have only one form for all persons in the simple past tense. Thus we say, for example, "If I were you," first person singular contrasting with indicative past "I was," but we say "If I had a dollar," presenting no contrast with "I had a dollar."

With these morphological-subjunctive type sentences illustrated in examples (1) through (7) above, students begin to be aware of the difference between indicative and subjunctive forms, and of some of the semantic uses to which the subjunctive is put, namely to express volition and to make statements which are hypothetical or contrary-to-fact.

Now it is possible to proceed to what I have referred to as the syntactic subjunctive, examples of which are to be found in sentences (8) to (12) below:

- (8) She studies. --> I order...*her to study.*
- (9) He goes with us. --> I want...*him to go with us.*
- (10) You come in.--> I beg ...*you to come in.*
- (11) We return. --> They advise...*us to return.*
- (12) They help me. --> I need...(for) *them to help me.*

Once again, a transformation drill could be used to make students aware of the structure shared by all of these sentences. So, in accordance with (8) to (12) above, the instructor could provide a simple sentence as given on the left, and ask students to transform each sentence by putting it into the frame given on the right. All of these sentences share the structure Subject NP + Indicative Verb + (for) + Object Noun or Pronoun + "to" Infinitive + (Object of Infinitive). The instructor may or may not wish to discuss the actual grammatical structure of these sentences as I've just presented it. Grammatical terms can be limited to simple terms like "conjugated verb," "infinitive," or "object pronoun," or even eliminated altogether. What counts is that students be able to recognize the similar structure shared by all of the sentences in the group.

Following exposure to this group of sentences as a type of structure, students are again asked to generalize about the meaning of the main-clause verbs in the complex sentences, and they notice that these verbs express volition or necessity. After working with

sentences (1) through (12), students have a pretty good grasp of the notion of mood within their own language, a notion they may previously have been completely unaware of explicitly, but which they had long before grasped implicitly. And along with a knowledge of what modality is, they now have an understanding of how mood is formally expressed in English, including what specific sentence structures are required in order to express the subjunctive mood.

Finally, before making the transition to the Spanish subjunctive, an instructor might also introduce a few formulaic expressions, and ask students what they notice about the verbs in these expressions. Examples are given in (13) to (16):

- (13) Be that as it may...
- (14) Suffice it to say...
- (15) God forgive us!
- (16) So be it.

Not only are all of the verbs in these expressions examples of the subjunctive, in the form of the infinitive without "to," they also have in common the fact that they are jussives, hortatory or exclamatory in nature.

The Spanish Subjunctive

Students are now ready to be introduced to the Spanish subjunctive. This can be done by employing positive transfer, negative transfer, and partial transfer. I will begin with positive transfer. One option open to instructors following this approach is to use a transformation drill. Sentence (17) below is similar in meaning to the English sentence given as (1) above:

- (17) Lo hace ahora.--Le sugiero que...*lo haga ahora.*

Assuming no problem with the rest of the sentence, the instructor need only step in to help provide the correct form of the subordinate-clause verb, i.e. the subjunctive form, to get students to give the Spanish sentence shown on the right in (17). The class is then invited to repeat the sentence, individually and in chorus. There is no need at this point to discuss the fact that the new verb

form is "haga" and not "hace." More examples are needed first, so that a pattern can become apparent to the students:

(18) Llegan a tiempo. --> Yo les recomiendo que...*lleguen* a tiempo.

(19) Toma la medicina. --> Marta insiste en que...*tome* la medicina.

(20) Sales. --> Piden que...*salgas*.

Following exposure to a set of sentences such as these, students are ready to explain the pattern they discern, i.e. that after main-clause verbs expressing volition, Spanish uses "que" where English would have "that," and Spanish uses a different form of the verb from the expected, indicative, one, just as English does. The differences between the two languages is that, where the form in English is different only after third-person singular subjects (and second-person subjects with the verb "to be"), in Spanish there is a different verb form for each person (except of course that the first- and third-persons singular are the same).

At this point, the instructor should begin to drill paradigms of model verbs in the present subjunctive, preferably based on one of the sentences already introduced.³

So much for positive transfer. The instructor next works with partial transfer. Using sentences such as those given in (21) to (25) below, the instructor "begins again":

(21) Estudia. --> Ordeno que...*estudie*.

(22) Va con nosotros. --> Quiero que...*vaya* con nosotros.

(23) Uds. pasan. --> Les ruego a Uds. que ...*pasen*.

(24) Volvemos. --> Nos aconsejan que...*volvamos*.

(25) Me ayudan. --> Necesito que...*me ayuden*.

These sentences are a matter of partial transfer because neither in Spanish nor in English is the indicative used; a systematic alternative is employed in both languages, but the alternative is different for

³ Concerning contrary-to-fact statements, which, as we've seen, make use of the past subjunctive in English, I recommend avoiding this type of statement in Spanish at this point, even though it is a matter of positive transfer. It is important to avoid confusing students with too many tenses at once; therefore, work with contrary-to-fact statements in Spanish should be delayed until students can control the present subjunctive and are ready to learn the imperfect subjunctive.

each language. The task of the instructor is to show that the Spanish equivalents to English sentences which have the structure shown in (8) to (12) are constructed in Spanish with the morphological subjunctive, that is, with the same structure we saw in sentences (1) to (4) for English and (17) to (20) for Spanish. So, for example, the English sentence "I order her to study," which appears as sentence (8), has the structure NP + Indicative Verb + Object Pronoun + "to" Infinitive. With the help of a transformation drill, students discover that this English construction is rendered in Spanish by the construction NP (implied or expressed) + Indicative Verb + que + NP (implied or expressed) + Subjunctive Verb, i.e. by the morphological subjunctive pattern with which they are already familiar. Again, assuming there are no problems with the rest of the sentence, the instructor need only stand by to help produce the correct form of the subjunctive verb, in order to obtain, for example, the Spanish sentence "Ordeno que estudie," given in (21).⁴

Now for negative transfer, so-called because it involves sentences in which Spanish uses the subjunctive but English uses the indicative. This is traditionally considered a difficult type of lesson, but I believe that if students have been introduced to the subjunctive in the way I have suggested, they will be well-prepared for this stage. I will address expressions of emotion on the one hand, and expressions of doubt and negative opinion on the other.

⁴Two points can be made here concerning the use of the infinitive in Spanish. The first point rarely causes difficulty for English speakers. I am referring to the construction NP + Indicative Verb + Infinitive, when the subjects of both verbs are the same. The sentence "I want to go," for example is "Quiero ir" in Spanish. I see no problem with the way this point is traditionally taught. The other point has to do with those verbs in Spanish that express volition and which can take either a subordinate-clause construction with the verb in the subjunctive (when the subjects of the two clauses are different), or the construction (NP) + Object Clitic Pronoun + Indicative Verb + Infinitive. For example, Cressey and Borsoi contrast the following sentences:

Mando que salgas. --> Te mando salir.

Dejo que salgas. --> Te dejo salir.

Prohibo que salgas. --> Te prohibo salir.

(Cressey, W. and E. Borsoi, 1972, *Tertulia*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts). In principle, these sentences should cause English speakers little problem, since the infinitive construction in Spanish resembles the frequent English construction with the infinitive, as in "I order you to leave." The trick for students is to learn which Spanish verbs allow this variable construction and to avoid overextending its application. While this is a fine point for students who are just being introduced to the Spanish subjunctive, it is nevertheless important and should be taken up as soon as students are comfortable with the morphological subjunctive.

The instructor might begin by briefly presenting a set of English sentences as follows:

- (26) I'm sorry that you are cold.
- (27) I'm glad that you are not going away.
- (28) I'm afraid that they aren't listening.

Students, when asked, notice that all of the main-clause verbs in this set of sentences express emotion. In a transformation exercise, they will notice that simple sentences undergo no change when put into subordinate clauses in which the main-clause verb expresses emotion. This is shown in (26a) to (28a):

- (26a) You are cold. --> I'm sorry that...*you are cold.*
- (27a) You're not going away. --> I'm glad that...*you are not going away.*
- (28a) They aren't listening. --> I'm afraid that...*they aren't listening*

Following this exercise, the instructor introduces Spanish sentences which express emotion, perhaps by means of a transformation exercise as shown in (29) to (31) below:

- (29) Ud. tiene frío. --> Siento que...Ud. *tenga* frío.
- (30) No te vas. --> Me alegro de que... no te *vayas*.
- (31) No escuchan. --> Temo que...no *escuchen*.

Because students will by now be familiar with the forms and patterns of the subjunctive in Spanish, they will have little difficulty accepting the fact that expressions of emotion are conveyed by the subjunctive in Spanish, even though the indicative is used with equivalent expressions in English.

The same sort of exercise can be used to contrast the fact that expressions of doubt and negative opinion employ the indicative in English but the subjunctive in Spanish. Consider the following English sentences:

- (32) Maria is here.
- (33) They are sleeping now.
- (34) They are coming back.

When put into a frame in which doubt or negative opinion is expressed, there is no change in the subordinate clause:

- (32a) I doubt that...*Maria is here.*
- (33a) Do you think (that)...*they are sleeping now?*
- (34a) I don't believe (that)...*they are coming back.*

In Spanish we are required to use the subjunctive in similar sentences, and once again students can discover this by means of a transformation exercise. This is shown in (35) to (37) below:

- (35) Maria esta aqui. --> Dudo que...*Maria este* aqui.
- (36) Duermen. --> Cree Ud. que...*duerman*?
- (37) No vuelven. --> No creo que...*vuelvan*.⁵

Conclusion

I have tried to show that by presenting what can be called the English subjunctive, an instructor can make it easier for students to learn the Spanish subjunctive. I first discussed a set of English sentences which contain examples of the morphological subjunctive. Although this is only a vestigial construction in modern English, being aware of it can help students understand why the subjunctive exists in Spanish and how to use it. I also discussed one of the most important syntactic constructions English uses to express the subjunctive mood, exemplified by the sentence "I told her to study."

In addition to the syntactic construction discussed in this paper, important grammatical constructions for expressing the subjunctive mood include the modal auxiliaries, clauses which begin with the jussive "Let" (e.g., "Let her come in"), gerund constructions (as in "I insist on seeing the manager"), and lexical triggers such as "whatever" and "whoever". All of these constructions are not simple possible alternatives to the subjunctive, as textbooks not infrequently state. Each is a predictable structure for expressing the subjunctive mood.

In short, what looks at first like a baffling, alien concept to students of a foreign language can be made less baffling if presented

⁵ These sentences should of course be contrasted with expressions of certainty which take the indicative, such as *Creo que* and the like.

in relation to the students' native language. In the case of English speakers learning the Spanish subjunctive, this means making students aware that the morphology of the subjunctive still exists to a limited extent in English; that there are certain required, predictable constructions that English uses where Spanish uses the morphological subjunctive; and, most importantly, that they, the students, already have a thorough, if implicit, grasp of the semantic motivation underlying the subjunctive mood -- the motivation to express such concepts as volition, necessity, and unreality.

REFERENCES

- Bull, W. (1984). *Spanish for Teachers: Applied Linguistics*. Melbourne, FLA: Krieger. Reprint of 1965 edition.
- Cressey, W. & Borsoi, E. (1972). *Tertulia*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Dawson, A. & Dawson, L. (1985). *Dicho y hecho*. New York: John Wiley. Second edition.
- Espinosa, A & Wonder, J. (1976). *Gramática Analítica*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Gili Gaya, S. (1983). *Curso Superior de Sintaxis Española*. Barcelona: Bibliograf. Fifteenth edition.
- Iglesias, M. & Meiden, W. (1986) *Spanish for Oral and Written Review*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, Winston. Third edition.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. Brower (Ed.), *On Translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Real Academia Española. (1979). *Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Sallese, N. & Fernández de la Vega, O. (1968). *Repaso: Gramática Moderna*. New York: American Book.
- Stockwell, R., Bowen, D., & Martin, J. (1965). *The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tarr, F.C. & Centeno, A. (1973). *A Graded Spanish Review Grammar with Composition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

100/*Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*

- Terrell, T. & Hooper, J. (1974). A semantically based analysis of mood in Spanish. *Hispania*, 57, 484-494.
- Turk, L. & Espinosa, A. (1974). *Foundation Course in Spanish*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Academic Writing Task Surveys: The Need for a Fresh Approach

GEORGE BRAINE

At most American universities, the teaching of composition to undergraduate students is "centralized" (Kinneavy, 1983) in the English departments at lower-division levels. Historically, lower division composition courses were created as "service" courses to the rest of the academy (Berlin, 1985), a role they continue to play to date. For instance, the objective of the *Freshman English Course for Foreign Students* at the University of Texas at Austin is "to help students to read and write English with the skill they will need to succeed academically at the university" (Underwood, n.d.).

However, some critics maintain that freshman English is not performing its assigned task. Mike Rose (1983) complains that these courses are "self-contained", having "little conceptual or practical connection to the larger academic writing environment" (p. 109). Blair (1988) criticizes freshman English courses for imposing the English department's own "brand of writing" (p. 384) on students from other disciplines. In the field of Teaching English as a Foreign/Second Language (TEFL/TESL), Horowitz (1986), Johns (1987), Shih (1986) and Wallace (1985) have recently renewed the demand for the integration of college composition courses with academic discourse.

In order to design composition courses that teach academic discourse, the writing tasks of various disciplines must be determined first. Over the years, researchers such as Behrens (1978), Kroll (1979), Ostler (1980), Johns (1981), Friedrichs and Pearson (1981), Rose (1983), Eblen (1984), Bridgeman and Carlson (1984), Kiniry and Strenski (1985), Wallace (1985), and Horowitz (1986) have stressed the need for systematic attempts to identify academic (writing) tasks. However, on what basis can researchers decide which disciplines, and which writing tasks from those disciplines, merit investigation and integration with composition courses? An obvious choice would be the disciplines which attract a significant population of students enrolled in composition courses, and the most frequently assigned writing tasks from those disciplines.

According to the Institute of International education (IIE), more than 40 percent of the foreign undergraduate students enrolled at

American universities major in science and technology (Zikopoulos and Julian, 1986). At some institutions, the percentage may be even higher. For instance, at The University of Texas at Austin, which has the third highest enrollment of foreign students in the nation, 63 percent of the undergraduate foreign students registered during the 1987/88 academic year were enrolled in the College of Natural Sciences and the College of Engineering ("Statistical Handbook"). All undergraduate foreign students, like the majority of their American counterparts, are required to take freshman English.

Noll (1964) has delineated the differences between the scientific and humanistic methods, contrasting the precise nature of the former with the subjective nature of the latter. Trimble (1985), based on his examination of scientific and technical writing, defines scientific discourse as the "presentation of facts, hypotheses," and as not being concerned with "forms of English that editorialize, express emotions or emotionally based argument or [is] fictional or poetic in nature." (p. 10).

Thus, the formation of composition courses for undergraduate foreign students majoring in science and technology appears to be justified in three contexts: 1) the presence of a large population of undergraduate foreign students who major in science and technology; 2) university regulations which require these students to take composition courses at the lower-division level; and 3) the existence of a well-defined method and discourse conventions common to scientific disciplines. If reliable data on the discourse conventions of undergraduate science and technology courses could be obtained, such data could form the basis for the design of integrated lower-division composition courses.

The literature on Needs Analysis records a large number of surveys which have attempted to determine the academic tasks required of students at American universities. However, most of these surveys have recently been criticized by Horowitz (1986), Raimes (1987) and Zamel (1987). Spack (1988), claiming that academic writing has not yet been properly defined, has gone so far as to state that academic writing should therefore be taught by teachers of the disciplines, and not by English instructors.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to evaluate the academic writing task surveys conducted at American universities in order to determine if they provide adequate data on academic writing. To keep its scope within reasonable limits, this paper will only consider surveys which have examined science and technology writing tasks at the undergraduate level during the last ten years.

ACADEMIC WRITING TASK SURVEYS

To date, the identification of academic writing tasks has been the sole objective of only a few surveys. Instead, most researchers have blended other objectives such as the determination of faculty views, evaluations and expectations of student writing, and students' views and expectations of writing programs into their surveys. Thus, the determination of academic writing tasks often comprises only a segment of a larger study.

Behrens' (1978) study, which has earned praise for its thoroughness and care in presenting conclusions, was conducted among 128 faculty members at the American University in Washington, DC. It was designed "to measure faculty perceptions of student literacy" and "to discuss what kinds of writing, and how much of it, is being assigned in disciplines other than literature" (pp. 54-55). Behrens divided the faculty into four broad academic areas: humanities, sciences, social sciences, and professional studies. The sciences comprised twenty faculty members from biology, chemistry, math and statistics, and physics.

In the questionnaire used for the survey, faculty were asked to classify papers according to three types: reports, themes or essays, and research papers. Behrens defines reports as "papers of limited scope providing factual discussion of the results of a piece of research", themes or essays as "papers offering conclusions or opinions based upon experiences and/or reading" and research papers as "papers based on extensive research of written material on a subject" (p. 57).

Of the 288 courses reported in the survey, 86 percent required papers of some type. The sciences ranked second in the number of papers assigned, 61 percent of the courses requiring papers. None of the undergraduate courses in the sciences assigned *themes or essays*, 93 percent assigned *reports* and 8 percent assigned *research papers*.

Behrens also notes that humanities and science professors assign papers of the shortest length and that, 95 percent of the time, science professors designate a topic for the papers. In 21 percent of the science courses, the professors did not specify the procedures (format, types of evidence to consider, reference sources, etc.) to be followed. Some procedures were specified in 42 percent of the courses, and in 37 percent, procedures were specified at length.

The faculty were also requested to provide information on examinations. Behrens notes that 85 percent of all undergraduate courses required a final examination. In the science courses, 82 percent had in-class final examinations, 64 percent had midterm examinations, and 36 percent gave regular quizzes. Take-home examinations were not assigned in any of the science courses.

In 1979, Kroll used a three-part questionnaire to determine "the past, present and future writing needs of students" (p. 219), which would indicate the types of writing students should be exposed to in composition courses. The questionnaire was distributed among 35 students enrolled in freshman English courses for international students and 20 native-speaker students enrolled in regular freshman English at the University of Southern California. Although exact figures were not quoted, the majority of the international students in the survey were majoring in engineering, science and business.

In the questionnaire, Kroll classified past writing needs into nine tasks, ranging from "fill out questionnaires" to "write reports for classes other than for English courses." Eighteen percent of the international students stated that they had never written reports for disciplines other than English.

Under "current writing needs," Kroll sought information on six types of academic writing tasks. Of the international students, 33 percent wrote papers which "integrate[d] mathematical or statistical data into a report," 54 percent wrote "reports of lab experiments in continuous discourse," and 54 percent wrote "term papers." The corresponding figures for the native-speaker students were 15 percent, 21 percent and 55 percent. According to Kroll, the above figures are attributable to more foreign students majoring in scientific subjects than Americans. While only four respondents indicated difficulty with papers in their academic majors, most foreign students indicated that term papers in fields other than their academic majors posed the greatest challenge to them.

To determine the students' future writing needs, Kroll classified writing into sixteen tasks, three of which related to academic writing. Among the international students, 35 percent expected to write survey reports, 59 percent expected to write technical reports, and 48 percent expected to write reports of scientific experiments. For the native-speakers, the corresponding figures were 35 percent, 40 percent and 30 percent.

In conclusion, Kroll observes that the "traditional expository essay course" (freshman English?) does not expose the students to "many areas of written English" (p. 225), and strongly urges that

"students be given the opportunity to gain familiarity with modes of discourse they will be called upon to use" (p. 226).

While Kroll's survey dealt with international and American students at the freshman level, Ostler (1980) conducted her survey among international students ranging from freshmen to Ph.D. candidates. Ostler's survey, which was conducted at the American Language Institute of the University of Southern California, attempted to determine the students' assessment of their own academic skills needs as well as the students' "self-assessment of their success in using English in varied social and business settings" (p. 489). All the 133 students surveyed were enrolled in English as a second language (ESL) classes. Fifteen students (11 percent of the sample) majored in the hard sciences, and 44 students (33 percent) majored in engineering. Seventy-two percent of the students surveyed were undergraduates, while 26 percent were graduates.

The students were asked to choose from a list of sixteen academic tasks which might be required in various majors. The following writing tasks were included in the list: multiple choice examinations, essay examinations, lab experiments, book reviews, research proposals, and research papers. Statistics relevant to students majoring in hard sciences and engineering are summarized below.

TABLE 1
Writing tasks needed according to major*

Major	Hard Sciences	Engineering
Task		
M-choice exams	47	50
Essay exams	47	52
Lab experiments	60	65
Book reviews	33	43
Research proposal	27	43
Research papers	40	57

* all scores in percentages (from Ostler, 1980, p. 493)

The academic writing tasks according to class standing are indicated below:

TABLE 2

Writing tasks needed according to class standing*

Year in college	1-2	3-4	MA/MS	PhD
Task				
M-choice exams	53	22	37	20
Essay exams	47	56	53	40
Lab reports	43	33	13	20
Critiques	41	44	57	60
Research proposals	29	11	43	60
Research papers	53	78	60	80

* all scores in percentages (from Ostler, 1980, p. 495)

Based on the results of the survey, Ostler concludes that ESL courses should teach "specialized skills such as reading academic journals and papers and writing critiques" (p. 499). She also notes the distinct differences between the academic (writing) tasks assigned to undergraduate and graduate students. While undergraduates expressed a greater need for taking multiple choice exams and writing lab reports, graduate students were required to write critiques, research proposals and research papers more often.

In order to develop UCLA's Freshman Preparatory Program, Rose (1983) analyzed 445 quizzes, examinations, reports and papers assigned by 17 academic departments at UCLA, reducing the sample to eight "schemata" or "superframes." Arranged hierarchically from simple to more complex activities, the schemata were listing, definition, seriation, classification, summary, comparison/contrast, analysis and academic argument. Except for argument, the schemata corresponded to the intellectual domains of the cognitive psychologists. Analyzing his sample, Rose concluded that 1) most items required expository-transactional writing, while the balance required "academic" argument; 2) students had to deal with a great deal of information gathered from lectures and texts; 3) while in-

class examinations required a structured, "nearly regurgitative" response, the other assignments required the students to "reflect on a broad range of complex material, to select and order information in various contexts" (p. III), and that 4) rhetorical conventions considered correct in one discipline may not be acceptable in another.

Stating that composition instructors should be better aware of student writing in other disciplines, Eblen (1983) conducted a survey at the University of Northern Iowa. The survey was designed to determine 1) the qualities which faculty value in student writing, 2) the problems which faculty encounter in student writing, and 3) to what extent "overall faculty standards for students' writing compare with the criteria established for a university-wide competency requirement" (p. 343).

A ten-page questionnaire was returned by 266 faculty members, 54 of whom were from Natural Sciences. Lab reports (57 percent) were the most frequently assigned writing tasks by Natural Sciences faculty, followed by essay tests (43 percent), documented papers (23 percent), technical reports (20 percent) and analytical papers (18 percent).

Perhaps the most wide-ranging academic writing task survey was conducted by Bridgeman and Carlson (1984), who surveyed 190 faculty from 34 American and Canadian universities with a high enrollment of foreign students in order to determine the writing tasks faced by beginning undergraduate and graduate students. A 16-page questionnaire containing 6 major sections was used in the survey. The questionnaire sought information on 1) the academic departments surveyed, 2) the writing task demands of each department, 3) the criteria used to evaluate written assignments, 4) data on writing problems of native and non-native speakers, 5) use or potential use of a writing sample in the student admission process, and 6) the acceptability of ten specific task types listed in the questionnaire for use in the admission or placement of students at the beginning of graduate work.

Seven disciplines (departments) in which most foreign students enroll were targeted for the survey. The following departments were selected at graduate level: electrical engineering, civil engineering, computer science, chemistry, business administration, and psychology. Data regarding undergraduate writing was solicited only from English departments since "most writing at undergraduate level was done in English courses" (p. 18).

Respondents were given a list of nine writing tasks and asked to note the frequency with which each task was assigned. The relevant statistics for science and technology tasks are given in table 3.

TABLE 3
Frequency of Science and Technology Writing tasks

Writing task	Assignments per semester	Civil Eng.	Electrical Eng.	Chemistry	Computer Science
Lab reports	3-6 7+	31 12	32 12	21 17	40 20
Brief summary of article	3-6 7+	23 4	8 4	17 10	16 4
Brief research papers	3-6 7+	27 0	4 0	7 0	16 3
Longer research papers	3-6 7+	0 0	0 0	3 0	4 0
Expository/critical writing	3-6 7+	8 0	0 0	0 0	8 8
Exams with essays	3-6 7+	31 12	8 4	34 21	40 8
Group writing	3-6 7+	4 0	0 0	0 0	4 0
Case studies	3-6 7+	15 0	4 0	0 0	4 0

(from Bridgeman and Carlson, 1984, pp. 258-259)

Wallace (1985), whose dissertation describes the advantages of using an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach in undergraduate composition classes, used a questionnaire to survey faculty members from seven Illinois universities, selected for their "similar" non-native student enrollments. The focus of the survey was on undergraduate courses, and of the 123 faculty members who responded to the survey, 10 were from pre-engineering, 12 were from mathematics, and 13 each were from chemistry and computer science.

Wallace listed 15 writing tasks in the questionnaire, and requested the respondents to indicate how often each task was assigned to non-native students each semester. All the chemistry

professors assigned lab reports, and also considered lab reports to be the most important writing task. More than 50 percent of the computer science faculty assigned program documentation. Math faculty listed article summaries as the most frequent writing task they assigned. In pre-engineering, article abstracts were the most frequently assigned writing task, and the faculty thought that article abstracts and lab reports were the most useful writing tasks for their students.

Based on data obtained from the questionnaire, Wallace concluded that "non-native students need to be taught English through an approach that will foster research abilities, analytical thought, and exam taking strategies" (pp. 30-31).

Stating that "the form in which a writer expresses meaning [is determined] by the genre and the specific demands of the task" (p. 447), Horowitz (1986) set out to identify the writing tasks assigned in a variety of disciplines at American universities. Instead of surveying faculty or students with a questionnaire, handouts on which papers of any type, book or article reviews, and take home exams were assigned were obtained from 36 faculty members at Western Illinois University. The sample included 54 writing assignments from 29 courses taught in 17 academic departments, including home economics, biology, geology, and zoology departments generally categorized as belonging to science and technology.

Rather than listing them by genres (such as lab reports, article summaries, etc.), Horowitz classified the writing tasks according to seven categories, ranging from "summary of/reaction to a reading" to "research project". The classification, according to Horowitz, had "enough specificity to capture essential differences among tasks and enough generality to place into the same category essentially similar tasks. . . from different subject areas" (p. 449). Fifteen of the tasks fitted into the "synthesis of multiple sources" category, while "summary of/reaction to a reading" and "report on a specified participatory experience" contained 9 tasks each.

Noting that the most striking feature of the tasks was their controlled nature, Horowitz concluded that "generally speaking, the academic writer's task is to . . . find, organize, and present data according to fairly explicit instructions" (p. 455). Horowitz recommends that English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses train students to 1) select relevant data from sources, 2) reorganize data in response to a question, and 3) encode data into academic English.

EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC WRITING TASK SURVEYS

For the purpose of evaluation, the above surveys have been placed into two categories: a) surveys which used questionnaires as the data gathering instrument, and b) surveys which examined the actual assignments given to students.

Surveys which used questionnaires

The surveys of Behrens (1978), Kroll (1979), Ostler (1980), Eblen (1983), Bridgeman and Carlson (1984) and Wallace (1985) belong to this category. The questionnaires in these surveys were directed at students and/or faculty members. As mentioned earlier, in most surveys, the determination of academic writing tasks was one of many objectives. Questionnaires directed at faculty attempted to measure faculty perceptions of students' writing abilities as well as the types and quantity of writing assigned to the students by the faculty. Eblen's objectives, for instance, were to determine faculty views regarding the quality and problems of student writing; Bridgeman and Carlson's lengthy questionnaire, besides seeking information on academic writing tasks, also attempted to determine how faculty evaluated students' writing, faculty perceptions of students' writing problems, and faculty views on the acceptability of a number of writing tasks in admission and placement tests at universities; and Wallace sought faculty views on the importance of various writing tasks as well as faculty perceptions of students' writing problems.

The surveys (and questionnaires) of Kroll, Ostler, and Wallace were directed at students. While Kroll attempted to determine the past, present and future writing needs of students, Ostler sought information on the language skills the students needed, and the students' assessments of their success in using English communicatively. Wallace's second questionnaire, which was directed at students, was meant to gather "each student's academic and career expectations" (p. 38) with regard to writing.

Questionnaires have been the most frequently used data-gathering instrument in survey research. In curriculum design, questionnaires not only provide information on the learners' needs, but also suggest to the learners that curriculum designers are

interested in their particular needs, and that an attempt is made to determine these needs in advance.

If a questionnaire is to serve its intended purpose, the data gathered must be accurate and reliable. A commonly used technique to ensure the accuracy and reliability of incoming data is to pre-test the questionnaire on a sample of respondents, which enables the researcher to eliminate areas of ambiguity before the final version of the questionnaire is sent out. However, of the surveys listed above, only Bridgeman and Carlson mention the use of questionnaire development strategies, whereby information gathered from a review of the literature, consultations with an advisory committee, and interviews with some faculty members were used in the formulation of the questionnaire items. Nevertheless, as the following evaluation shows, the Bridgeman and Carlson survey did not escape the shortcomings of all the surveys which used questionnaires.

Other than Bridgeman and Carlson, who were employees of the Educational Testing Service, all the researchers who developed and used questionnaires were associated either with mainstream English departments (Behrens, Eblen) or with English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) programs (Kroll, Ostler, Wallace). When such researchers question students and faculty from other disciplines, the researchers tend to use terminology that they are familiar with to identify writing genres, which may not be identical with the terminology used by the faculty being queried. In fact, Swales (1986) states that "those who routinely or professionally operate within a genre are more likely to possess an overt knowledge of the conventions of a genre" (p. 4) than those who become involved in it only occasionally.

An examination of some terms used by the the researchers to identify academic writing genres illustrates this problem.

Behrens:	report; themes or essays; research papers.
Kroll:	papers integrat(ing) mathematical or statistical data with a report; reports of lab experiments in continuous discourse; term papers.
Ostler:	lab experiments, book reviews; research proposals; research papers.

112/Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Eblen:	lab reports; documented papers; technical reports; analytical papers.
Bridgeman & Carlson:	lab reports; article summaries; research papers; expository/critical writing; group writing; case studies.
Wallace:	article summaries; article abstracts; group writing tasks; case studies; analysis papers; comparison/contrast papers; documented research papers; lab reports.

A closer examination of one genre, the lab report, illustrates the confusion that could result from the use of questionnaires. The writing of a lab report requires a complex mixture of contributory skills such as summary, paraphrase, seriation, description, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, interpretation, analysis and the integration of mathematical and scientific data into a text. Thus, the researchers who list papers which integrate mathematical or statistical data (Kroll), or analytical papers (Eblen), or analysis papers and comparison/contrast papers (Wallace) separate from lab reports would not only be applying multiple terms to describe what is essentially a single genre, but would also confuse the respondents (faculty or students from other disciplines). The use of multiple terms suggests theoreticians' speculations of how academic discourse should be taxonomized, since not even book reviews and article summaries are self-explanatory terms.

Defining the genres on the questionnaire itself may have removed the confusion. Although Behrens did attempt this approach, he only defined three genres (i.e. reports, themes or essays, research papers) which may be inadequate to describe the variety of writing activities that students encounter in the academy.

While questionnaire designers appear to have used multiple terms to identify essentially similar writing tasks, faculty from separate disciplines sometimes used different terms to identify what is essentially the same genre. The ubiquitous lab report, assigned by instructors throughout the range of science and technology disciplines, best illustrates this phenomenon. A lab report may also be known as a "standard experiment" in chemical engineering, a "final" report in aerospace and petroleum engineering, a "technical report" in mechanical engineering, and a "memorandum" in electrical

engineering (Braine, forthcoming). Thus, the use of a variety of terms not only by the researchers but also by faculty members could only increase the inaccuracy of the data.

Earlier in the evaluation, Bridgeman and Carlson were mentioned as the only researchers to employ questionnaire development strategies. However, within the context of this paper (science and technology writing at the undergraduate level), the Bridgeman and Carlson survey reveals a significant lapse. Since their objective was to determine the writing tasks of beginning undergraduate and graduate students, Bridgeman and Carlson surveyed only the English department faculty at undergraduate level on the assumption that "most writing by first-year undergraduate students was done in English courses" (p. 255). Analyzing the data, the researchers conclude that "lab reports for first-year undergraduate students are apparently relatively rare" (p. 260), hardly a surprise since only English department faculty were surveyed! Thus, the survey is of little use in the design of integrated composition courses at the lower-division level.

Some researchers have admitted the shortcomings of their surveys. For instance, Behrens states that surveys like his "might be a more accurate measure of what people think (or claim to think) than what they actually do" (p. 60), while Eblen (p. 347) admits that "self-reports may blend respondents' beliefs and intentions with actual practice." Horowitz (1986) has found fault with some of the studies quoted above, claiming that "instead of trying to discover and classify university writing tasks - a logical prior endeavor - [the surveys] begin with a set of preconceived classifications, forcing on the respondents the particular schema used in the survey (p. 448).

Surveys which examined writing assignments

Two surveys, that of Rose (1983) and of Horowitz (1986), fall into this category.

Prior to the establishment of UCLA's Freshman Preparatory Program, Rose collected and analyzed 445 quizzes, examinations, reports and papers from 17 academic departments at UCLA. Overwhelmingly expository, the assignments were reduced to eight basic schema or superframes - "eight activities that all of us use to process information and make meaning" (Kiniry and Strenski, 1985, p. 192). The schemata, identified as listing, definition, seriation, classification, summary, comparison/contrast, analysis, and

academic argument, were to be used in a composition course which used the "recursive approach."

Rose's study and its applications to curriculum design display at least two shortcomings. First, the sample of writing assignments consisted of quizzes and examinations as well as take-home (non-examination) assignments. Since answers to quizzes and examinations are written under time pressure to a specific audience (i.e. course instructors) already familiar with the subject matter, masses of data can be regurgitated, often in a rambling and disorganized manner. Course instructors may care only for content, paying little attention to organization and style. On the other hand, take-home assignments in science and technology disciplines for instance, are of a highly controlled nature: teachers provide the topic, detailed instructions on procedural sequence and content organization, and in some courses, manuals which explain the writing task in more detail. Extensive data and background information, and reference articles and/or books for further reading, are also common features (Horowitz, 1986; Braine, forthcoming).

Unlike quizzes and examinations, a significant percentage of take-home assignments are designated for a real or hypothetical audience beyond the classroom (Braine, forthcoming). Thus, students not only follow prescribed formats as described earlier, but are often required to adapt their writing styles to suit a specific audience. Engineering majors, for instance, may be required to submit reports to a non-technical manager, and a microbiology major may be assigned to write a magazine article explaining the results of his/her research to a lay audience. Thus, the mere regurgitation of information acceptable in examinations will not be permitted in take-home assignments. Rose's decision to place these two types of writing into one category may therefore be open to question.

The second shortcoming in Rose's survey is the formulation of the schema or superframes. These schema, such as summary, classification, comparison/contrast etc., are only contributory skills to a broader writing task. For instance, a "book/article review" assignment requires summary, paraphrase and evaluation skills. Thus, the classification of academic writing according to contributory skills could fragment and thereby misrepresent the writing process.

Horowitz's (1986) analysis of assignments has a number of advantages over that of Rose. First, the survey dealt only with take-home assignments. Second, the academic departments and courses

from which the assignments were obtained are specified. Finally, the classification of assignments was not according to a contributory skills as Rose had done, but according to task. Horowitz's classification yielded seven categories which not only captured the essential differences between tasks, but also caught the similarities between tasks which may at first appear to be different. A closer look at the definition of one category illustrates the basis for Horowitz's classification.

Report on a specified participatory experience . . . none of the data needed to be obtained from a reading, . . . students were assigned a specific "scene," either to observe passively or to participate in . . . They were also armed with a list of things to look for in that scene and a framework within which to interpret what they observed.

The writing task itself usually involved reporting details of the experience . . . and then coming to some kind of conclusion about . . . the experience. This conclusion was also typically an answer to an explicit question. (p. 450)

The lab report genre falls within the above category. However, unlike "lab report", a term which may evoke different scenarios in varying contexts, Horowitz's category explicitly describes the activities that are required to perform the tasks, as well as the framework within which the task must be performed.

Thus, of the surveys discussed above, Horowitz's appears to be the only one which created an accurate classification after examining the data. However, Horowitz's data consisted of assignments from academic disciplines as diverse as marketing and biology, which ignores an important conceptual basis for composition research and pedagogy discussed at the beginning of this paper: each discipline is a separate discourse community with its own norms, conventions and rhetorical strategies. The inclusion of writing tasks from the humanities, the social sciences, business and science in a single classification violates the above concept, thus making the survey's usefulness to academic-writing curriculum design only marginal.

To sum up, the above evaluation has revealed the inadequacies of questionnaires as data gathering instruments in academic writing task surveys; analyses of assignments given to students have been shown to provide more accurate data. The need to separate examination papers from take-home assignments before writing tasks are classified has also been shown. Finally, the evaluation has highlighted the need to narrow academic task surveys to disciplines which have common norms, conventions, and rhetorical strategies, when the survey results are to be applied to the design of composition courses.

CONCLUSION

In an incisive essay which examines the role of English departments in academic writing instruction, Blair (1988) concludes that English departments, because they impose their own "brand" of English on students from other disciplines (a subtle form of linguistic oppression, according to Blair), should not have a special role in academic writing instruction - not even for freshman English. Instead, Blair suggests that faculty from the disciplines should be responsible for the teaching of writing within each discipline. This idea has found support from Spack (1988), an ESL/EFL specialist.

Although writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) programs (which encourage teachers in all disciplines to make writing part of the teaching and learning process in their courses) have been in existence for some time, Fulwiler (1984) contends that "increased teaching loads, large classes, administrative responsibilities, lack of collegial support, pressures to research, publish, write grants" (p. 115) may prevent faculty from practicing the precepts of the WAC movement. The focus of "writing" courses taught by non-English faculty may be on the written product (assigning grades to students' essays) than on the writing process (Mitchell, 1987). Thus, the "teaching" of writing is still largely the responsibility of the English departments, and the composition courses at lower-division level could be the last opportunity for many students to learn academic writing. The increasing number of "Writing in the Disciplines" courses now being offered by universities nationwide is evidence of the English departments' awareness of the writing needs of their students. However, unless the designers (and teachers) of these courses are truly aware of the norms, conventions, and rhetorical strategies of academic discourse, the courses will only teach the English departments' conception of interdisciplinary writing, pseudo-academic even at its best.

Since each discipline is considered a separate discourse community, composition courses which aim to teach academic writing should focus only on one discipline. That is, separate academic writing courses (such as "Writing in Electrical Engineering", "Writing in Chemistry" etc.) would be needed for students of each discipline. However, for logistical reasons, such narrowly focused courses cannot be centralized within English departments. Instead, composition courses that deal with broader

areas like science and technology, business, and social sciences, for students who major in those areas, is a distinctive possibility. And if such courses are to be successful, course designers and teachers must be aware of the true nature of the writing in those disciplines, an awareness which can come only from academic writing task surveys that provide accurate and reliable data.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the academic task surveys discussed above is that none focused on science and technology disciplines, an area which not only continues to attract a significant proportion of both foreign and American students, but which also has its own norms and discourse conventions. The same could be said for business and social sciences. If composition courses are to succeed in their aims, a fresh approach to curriculum design, using carefully planned academic writing task surveys, is a must.

REFERENCES

- Behrens, L. (1978). Writing, reading, and the rest of the faculty: A survey, *English Journal*, 67, 54-60.
- Berline, A. B. (1985). Rhetoric and poetic in the the English department: our nineteenth century inheritance. *College English*, 47, 521-533.
- Blair, C. P. (1988). Only one of the voices: Dialogic writing across the curriculum. *College English*, 50, 383-389.
- Braine, G. S. (forthcoming). Writing in science and technology: An analysis of assignments from ten undergraduate courses. *English for Specific Purposes Journal*, 8 (1).
- Bridgeman, C. and Carlson, S.. (1984). Survey of academic writing tasks. *Written communication*, 1, 247-280.
- Eblen, C. (1983). Writing across the curriculum: A survey of university faculty views and classroom practices. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 17, 343-348.
- Friederichs, J. and Pierson, H. D. (1981). What are science students expected to write? *ELT Journal*, 35, 407-410.
- Fulwiler, T. (1984). How well does writing across the curriculum work? *College English*, 46, 113-125.
- Horowitz, D. (1986). What professors actually require: academic tasks for the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 445-462.
- Johns, A.M. (1981). Necessary English: a faculty survey. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 51-57.

- Johns, A.M. (1987). Our students, ethnography, and the university culture. *TexTESOL III Newsletter*, 8, 1-4.
- Kiniry, M. and Strenski, E. (1985). Sequencing expository writing: A recursive approach. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 191-202.
- Kinneavy, J.L. (1983). Writing across the curriculum. *ADE Bulletin*, No. 76, pp. 7-14
- Kroll, B. (1979). A survey of the writing needs of foreign and American college freshman. *ELT Journal*, 33, 219-227.
- Mitchell, F. (1987). *Writing assignments across the curriculum: a study of a faculty interpretation of a university-wide writing requirement*. Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1987.
- Noll, J. (1964). Humanism as a method. *Education Forum*, 28, 494.
- Ostler, S.E. (1980). A survey of the academic needs for advanced ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 489-502.
- Raimes, A. (1987). *Why write? Perspectives in purpose and pedagogy*. Paper presented at the 21st Annual TESOL Convention, Miami Beach.
- Rose, M. (1983). Remedial writing courses: a critique and a proposal. *College English*, 45, 109-126.
- Shih, M. (1986). Content based approaches to teaching academic writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 617-648.
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: how far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 29-51. *Statistical Handbook, 1987-88*. Office of Institutional Studies, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Swales, J. (1986). *A genre-based approach to writing across the curriculum*. Paper presented at the RELC Seminar, Singapore.
- Trimble, L. (1985). *English for science and technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Underwood, G.N. (nd). *English 306Q: Rhetoric and composition for foreign students*. The University of Texas at Austin. Pamphlet.
- Wallace, R. (1985). *English for specific purposes in ESL undergraduate composition classes: rationale*. Dissertation, Illinois State University, 1985.
- Zamel, V. (1987). *Teaching composition: towards a pedagogy of questions*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Zikopoulos, M. and Julian, A.C. (1986). *Open door 1985-86: report on international educational exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.

The Second Language Acquisition Process in Immersion Contexts: Theory and Research

SAMUEL SMITH

The success of immersion language programs in North America has received widespread attention. Indeed, Krashen (1985) notes that "... Canadian-style immersion is clearly the most successful language teaching program ever recorded in the language teaching literature" (p.66). Swain & Lapkin (1982) and Genesee (1983, 1985, 1987) provide summaries of the immersion experience and overviews of the relevant research.

Immersion program reports constitute the majority of material available in the scholarly literature, a preponderance which Burns (1976) labels a "narrow focus on student achievement" (p.574). As this pedagogical approach was initially treated as an experiment, parents and school authorities demanded detailed, annual descriptions of program objectives and evaluations. Much of the debate over this material is centered on these outcome data, their validity, and interpretation, as summarized by Singh (1986) and Spilka (1976).

In contrast, the theoretical foundations of immersion have been accorded little attention. This paper outlines the major schools of thought regarding the "why's" of the immersion success.¹ As a traditional starting point, Lambert & Tucker (1972) is examined, and the theoretical rationale presented therein is outlined and analyzed. Second, the work of researchers who emphasize the importance of affective variables in the immersion experience is presented. Third, the contributions of theorists and researchers detailing the role of social factors are described. Then, the commentaries of Swain and Schumann, who highlight the interplay of the social and the affective, are reviewed. Last, Krashen's "monitor model" is detailed in light of immersion and subject-matter teaching in the second language classroom.

¹ The development in the language skills of learners in immersion is the sole focus of this discussion. Academic progress under such conditions is a parallel avenue of inquiry. The reader is referred to Genesee (1987) for a summary of research relevant to that topic.. It must be noted that not everyone herald immersion as an unqualified success.

St. Lambert

Lambert & Tucker (1972) is the traditional model for immersion research. This report of the pioneering immersion project in the Montreal suburb of St. Lambert, however, presents a curiously fragmented and incomplete theoretical picture; the authors provide such background information only in passing, offer no detailed comment thereon, and do not attempt to argue the validity of their theoretical assumptions in light of the reported results.

Lambert & Tucker note, first, the importance of age in the language learning process. Citing the research of Penfield and Roberts, they state that the parents' group which served as a driving force behind this project was

impressed with the recent educational research that showed what could be accomplished in teaching science and mathematics in kindergarten and elementary grades, and they realized how valuable early experience with a foreign language can be. (p.3)

Moreover, the parents also expressed a desire to initiate language contact "before stereotypes and prejudices had a chance to form" (p. 221). Exposure to a large amount of target-language discourse was considered key. In her review of the St. Lambert project presented in an appendix, parent Olga Milikoff commented: "The essence of the problem was how to increase the number of contact hours in French to attain fluency without sacrificing subject matter" (p. 223).

These assumptions receive little critical analysis, however, and limited comment. The researchers offer, for example, no detailed statistical information regarding the total hours of student exposure to the target language; nor do they consider this input factor in the final data presentation and summary.

In the work's summary, the authors note several affective changes and outcome behaviors manifest by the immersion learners. In a "Pupils' Opinions" questionnaire, Lambert & Tucker discover that, by grade five, sixty-five percent of the experimental group consider themselves "both French and English," rather than "more English-Canadian" or "more French-Canadian." A decidedly smaller number of the English- and French-speaking (monolingual) control students manifest such a balanced orientation. The researchers summarize this finding, noting that: "By the end of grades IV and V . . . they [immersion pupils] have come to appreciate French people and French ways of life"(p. 200).

However, although Lambert & Tucker consider this development "at least as important as the mastery of the other group's language" (p. 206), they do not consider the potential impact of increased empathy levels on the linguistic development of the immersion cohort.

Increased interest in the study of French is also demonstrated by the immersion language learners. "A great deal of French," Lambert & Tucker conclude, "has merely whetted the appetites of the experimental group children" (p. 208). Moreover, the researchers outline a rapidly developing general interest in language on the part of the students in the experimental immersion groups; these phenomena are labeled "language detective skills." In a description of the immersion cohort, this occurrence is featured:

Another recurring process experienced by the children was . . . the early development of linguistic "detective" capacity, that is, an attentive, patient, inductive concern with words, meanings, and linguistic regularities (p. 208).

Increased interest levels and related outcome behaviors are, however, relegated to the conclusion of the work, and no consideration of the potential importance of these increased levels is offered in the interpretation of the final results. Developing student self-esteem levels are similarly overlooked.

The social facet also receives limited comment. By design, Lambert & Tucker attempt to minimize the influence of socio-cultural factors in the study's results. With a complex program of pre-testing students and interviewing parents, these researchers isolated control groups comprised of students and parents statistically comparable to the immersion cohort. But both Burns (1986) and Genesee (1987) point out that the immersion learners and their controls were generally pupils of middle and upper-middle class background, potentially a factor in the experiment's outcome.

In sum, Lambert & Tucker (1972) is a presentation of the research findings; references to the reasons for the success of this pedagogical approach are few. The authors omit comment on a host of affective developments manifest by immersion students. Input factors, too, receive limited attention. The authors, then, offer no broad, theoretical framework in which to interpret the findings. They present no systematic overview of the factors governing the language development process under the experimental conditions. Omission of comment on the role of affective factors is especially interesting since Lambert was conducting work at St. Lambert while

simultaneously writing with Gardner the well-known 1972 work which highlights the critical nature of attitude and motivation in the second language development process.

Affective Variables

No comprehensive theoretical examination of the role of affective variables in second language development under immersion conditions is present in the literature. The writers of several research reports do, however, consider selected affective variables, such as personality factors, in immersion settings.

Swain & Burnaby (1976) examine affective variables and their roles in formal educational environments. Recalling that differences in personality characteristics had been noted between students in early-grade French-language immersion programs and their counterparts in English-language classes, these researchers attempt to statistically document this disparity; immersion and non-immersion children in Ontario served as subjects. This replication did uncover such inequalities. Immersion students, as a group, are found to be more "happy", more "cheerful", more "talkative", and to have a "greater tendency toward perfectionism," as assessed by their classroom teachers.

The scope of this study is limited. Methodological problems, moreover, are rife. Only scant, summary data are provided. Indeed, little information regarding the role of factors of affect in immersion settings is offered; only the presence of such is documented.

Two other research reports offer a more comprehensive examination of the influence of affect on linguistic development in immersion contexts. Hayaman, Genesee, & Tucker (1977) and Tucker, Hayaman & Genesee (1976) are both similar in design to Swain & Burnaby. Again, affective variables are examined as predictors of linguistic skill. In both of these studies, students from early immersion, late immersion, and monolingual (English-speaking) control groups were selected as subjects. Importantly, these authors include motivational factors in their investigation, as well. Indeed, level of motivation was found to be the sole significant predictor of success on the chosen language testing instrument. This result, too, was consistent across subject groups. The writers conclude that

regardless of group membership, students who are highly motivated, who have high need achievement and who have positive attitudes toward the French language and its speakers will perform better in all four aspects of French than those students who do not . . . (1976, p. 224).

With these findings, the uniqueness of the immersion language learning environment is minimized.

Additionally, in reporting this research, these authors highlight an important methodological concern:

To date, the evaluations of different types of French immersion programs have provided valuable information about the performance of *groups* of individuals receiving one type of second language training or another. However, these studies may mask some interesting individual variations within these groups. Thus although the pupils participating in the bilingual . . . programs have developed, as a group, a far greater facility in French than English pupils who have followed a conventional French-as-a- second-language program, it is nevertheless the case that there exists a wide range of variation in the French proficiency of both immersion students and pupils in conventional programs (1977, p. 227).

In sum, no theoretical overview of the importance of affective variables in immersion language learning is known; research studies considering such factors in these settings are few. Thus, to date no broader conclusion regarding affective impact is possible. Given the higher levels of interest demonstrated, almost universally, by immersion students (v. Genesee, 1983) and the results of Hayaman, Genesee, & Tucker, the role of affect and related factors warrants further examination.

Social Variables

Several theorists and researchers consider the social facet of the immersion process. Burns (1986), Baral (1983), and Genesee (1976) review the relevant literature. The central theme of these reviews is summarized by Genesee:

The vast majority of the research results emanating from French immersion projects have been relevant to a particular student population, namely, predominantly middle class, majority group youngsters of average or above average intelligence, with no particular problems and who are, therefore, likely to be relatively successful students. This bias in the research probably reflects the composition of most French immersion classes (p. 494).

Burns, in a sharper critique of the research literature, suggests that hidden social inequalities distort the final results and thus taint

the outcome data. Immersion "tends to be class biased" and achieving similar results "among the masses", he notes, is an "entirely different matter" (p. 584). Burns cites as research support for his contentions, however, only one unpublished review of immersion reporting methods, a document which he himself co-authored.

Statistic evidence of the selective nature of immersion cohorts has come to light; Trites & Price (1978), for example, examine biographical information from one thousand primary school pupils in Ontario and conclude that students entering French immersion programs tended to be "better off" financially, were more likely to have attended pre-school, were more often read to at home, and were more likely to have parents interested in French language.

Genesee (1976) sounds a note of caution, however. Citing the experiences of working class children and children from minority groups in immersion settings, he concludes that such subjects regularly performed as well in immersion environments (demonstrating both subject-matter and linguistic development) as did their middle class counterparts. He describes, moreover, an ongoing project of immersion programs within the Cincinnati public schools-- work which, to date, had uncovered no significant performance disparity linked to ethnic or socioeconomic background (v. also Genesee, 1987).

To conclude, several writers have argued that social factors play a critical role in the immersion success. This conclusion is not universally accepted, however; Genesee cites important research support to the contrary.

Affective and Social Variables

Two theoretical works examine the interrelationship between social and affective factors in immersion settings. Swain (1983) and Cohen & Swain (1976) suggest that the presence of social inequalities in a bilingual education classroom produces affective manifestations.

To develop this argument, Canadian-style immersion is contrasted with the bilingual education programs often encountered by non-English-speaking students completing an education in North American schools. Swain labels this type of schooling "submersion." She maintains that the relative prestige of the first and second languages is of critical importance. The comparatively

lower prestige of the first language in submersion settings, she contends, is manifest in program organization and implementation and this has clear consequences, in the affective sphere, for the native-speakers of the language of lower prestige.

Such students are, Swain notes, frequently "grouped indiscriminately with native English speakers" (1976, p. 45), and are confronted with teachers who are seldom specialists in language pedagogy. The linguistically monolithic nature of immersion student cohort, populated by native-speakers of a single language, and the pedagogical background of most immersion instructors stands in sharp contrast. The result for students in submersion, Swain argues, are negative effects on identity, orientation, self-esteem, and motivation; such affective changes hinder linguistic development. These writers believe that in the shortcomings of submersion-type programs are visible the factors which bring about successful linguistic and academic progress in immersion contexts.

Neither Swain nor Cohen & Swain cite a significant body of research as support for their contentions. To this end, a study of the *English*-language immersion experience of native French speakers (a linguistic minority in Canada) would offer a uniquely insightful opportunity to assess the views of these theorists in a more controlled manner; no such program, however, has received review.

Within arguments for his "acculturation model," Schumann (1978) also discusses the immersion experience with reference to social and affective considerations. He notes, in a brief paragraph, that immersion appears to offer evidence contradictory to this hypothesis, since students of immersion acquire second language proficiency in relative isolation from native-speakers of the target language. Schumann retorts, however, that such schooling must be viewed as an early stage of acculturation; he considers

second language acquisition in these immersion contexts to be a product of *enculturation*. In fact, reports emerging from the immersion programs indicate that there may be a level at which students cannot develop further without contact with native speakers of TL [target language]. . . . Thus, acculturation may be necessary to complete the learning process begun in the immersion programs (49).

Schumann's brief comment requires further development.

To summarize, the interplay between affective and social variables has also been proffered as the reason for successful second language development during immersion. But much of the comment to date remains unsupported by a body of research work.

Input Variables

The writings of Krashen (1981, 1982, 1985) offer a theoretical outline, tied to a growing body of research, to account for linguistic development during the immersion process. His widely-known "monitor model" predicts that exposure to "input," meaningful target-language material at a linguistic level at least minimally challenging to the hearer at the moment of exposure, is the sole causal variable in the second language acquisition process.

Krashen's model also considers the variables of affect, specifically, how such considerations influence the input process. He contends that such affective facets must be related to subconscious language acquisitions rather than to conscious learning; Krashen describes an "affective filter," a screen through which input is processed. This theorist offers a succinct summary of his model and its key elements:

People acquire second languages when they obtain comprehensible input and when their affective filters are low enough to let the input in. In other words, comprehensible input is the only causative variable in second language acquisition. All other factors thought to encourage or cause second language acquisition only work when they are related to comprehensible input (1981, p. 62).

Krashen then proceeds to argue that acquisition, as opposed to formal learning, is the sole basis of true fluency, thus directly tying input to the successful mastery of a second language.

Within the framework of this model, Krashen then offers an explanation of the immersion process, stating that

immersion "works" because, like other good methods, it provides the students with a great deal of comprehensible input-- subject matter material is made comprehensible to immersion students in several ways: the exclusion of native speakers helps ensure that teachers will speak at a language level comprehensible to the non-native speaker, and text and materials are supplemented and adapted to the immersion students' level (1985, p. 16).

Krashen further argues that the educational setting of immersion is marked by an ideal affective climate. Pupils want to understand the instructor, and therefore they channel interest for school into the language acquisition process. Anxiety levels in such contexts are, he contends, often low.

While Lambert & Tucker suggested that massive amounts of exposure were a theoretical necessity, Krashen contends that it is not the amount of input alone that is critical, but rather the meaningfulness of the target language material:

The Input Hypothesis thus asserts that it is the comprehensible input factor that is responsible for the success of immersion, not simply the fact that immersion students are exposed to a great deal of second language (1985, p. 17).

To support this contention, he cites the linguistic development manifested by university-level language learners in an immersion-like context (Edwards, Wesche, Krashen, Clement, Kruidenier, 1984). Indeed, Krashen claims the vast immersion research literature as empirical basis for his proposed model of second language development

Krashen's 1985 work, *The Input Hypothesis*, also contains suggestions for practical application of his ideas. Chief among these is the description of a "sheltered language course," subject-matter teaching in a target language at the post-secondary level. He outlines the possible applications of this idea to intermediate- and advanced-level classes in English as a Second Language in the U. S. And Edwards *et al.*, cited above, describes the implementation of sheltered tuition at the University of Ottawa.

As a theoretical model with a body of research support, the work of Krashen must be considered most relevant to the mosaic of immersion theory. First, he is the sole writer to directly poses the question: "Why does immersion work?" He responds with a comprehensive theoretical response. In contrast, Lambert & Tucker (1972) give scant attention to this matter, and their research focus is reflected in much of the later literature.

For reasons of scope, too, Krashen's explanation of the immersion phenomenon must be considered superior. Cohen & Swain (1976), to cite an example, discuss the role of affect in the immersion process, yet paint no larger or more detailed framework for the second language development process in such settings.

With such theoretical breadth, Krashen does not directly contradict much of the above-cited commentary and research. In fact, he embraces the suggestions of Cohen & Swain (1976) in his description of affective considerations in immersion language development.

Last, ongoing empirical research relevant to the immersion-like settings of sheltered language courses continues to provide support

for Krashen's conceptualization of linguistic development in such settings.

Arguably, one might contend that the "monitor model" was developed, at least in part, in light of the immersion movement. Indeed, this theoretical framework achieved near-final form between 1972 and 1976, a time period clearly corresponding to the initial burst of interest in immersion following Lambert & Tucker (1972) and the dissemination of a wealth of research material from pilot immersion programs in Canada. Whether Krashen's model predicts the immersion success, or whether the immersion data were crucial in the development of the model must remain an open question.

For reasons of scope and empirical support, then, the arguments of Krashen must be considered most useful. With his comprehensive theoretical outline of the second language development process, he offers the best explanation of "why immersion works" currently available.

The above-cited writers and researchers have, nonetheless, outlined directions for further research and investigation on this theme. Lambert & Tucker note the importance of age in the immersion context, an emphasis which has received only limited attention. Work with sheltered students will be crucial in this respect. Swain & Burnaby highlight personality factors, and Tucker, Hayaman, & Genesee give attention to attitudinal and motivational variables as well. These affective themes, too, warrant further investigation relative to immersion environments. The questions of social background examined by Burns and Swain require empirical research. And the commentary of Schumann, linking his ideas on "acculturation" to immersion environments is wanting for further development. In short, many of the unknowns in the immersion equation highlight areas of debate and uncertainty relative to second language development generally.

Nonetheless, to highlight the debate regarding the "why's" of language development during immersion in no way degrades this educational approach. The results of immersion schooling are manifest and well-documented. That the theoretical bases of such tuition require critical examination in no way lessens the practical results reported to date. On the contrary, an incomplete picture of the theoretical underpinnings of immersion and immersion-like contexts should serve to bring about a higher level of interest in this educational approach on the part of second language acquisition thinkers and researchers.

REFERENCES

- Baral, D.P. Second language acquisition theories relevant to bilingual education. In R.V. Padilla, (Ed.), *Theory, Technology, and Public Policy on Bilingual Education*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Burns, G.E. (1986). French immersion implimentation in Ontario: Some theoretical, policy, and applied issues. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 42, 572-591.
- Cohen, A.D. and Swain, M. (1976). Bilingual education: The immersion model in the North American Context. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10, 45-53.
- Cziko, G., et al (1978). *Graduates of Early Immersion: Retrospective Views of Grade 11 Students and Their Parents* (Mimeo) Montreal: McGill University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 153 462)
- Edwards, H., Wesche, M., Krashen, S., Clement, R., & Kruidenier, B. (1984). Second language acquisition through subject-matter teaching: A study of sheltered psychology classes at the University of Ottawa. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41, 268-282.
- Genesee, F. (1976). The suitability of immersion programs for all children. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 13, 494-515.
- Genesee, F. (1981). A comparison of early and late second language learning. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 13, 115-128
- Genesee, F. (1983). Bilingual education of majority language children: The immersion experiments in review. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 4, 1-46.
- Genesee, F. (1985). Second language learning through immersion: A review of U.S. programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 541-561.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning Through Two Languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Tucker, G.R. (1977). Affective factors and language exposure in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 27, 225-241.
- Krashen, S.D. (1981). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. *Schooling and Language Minority Students:*

- A *Theoretical Framework*. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual-bicultural Education.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lambert, W.E. (1977). The effects of bilingualism on the individual: Cognitive and sociocultural consequences. In P.A. Hornby (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological, Social, and Educational Implications*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lambert, W.E. & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lyster, R. (1987). Speaking immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 43, 701-717.
- Schumann, J. A. (1978). The acculturation model. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Singh, R. (1986). Immersion: Problems and principles. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 42, 559-571.
- Spilka, I.V. (1976). Assessment of second language performance in immersion programs. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32, 543-561.
- Stern, H.H. (1984). A quiet revolution: Second-language teaching in Canadian contexts-- achievements and new directions. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 40, 506-524.
- Swain, M. & Burnaby, B. (1976). Personality characteristics and second language learning in young children: A pilot study. *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, 11, 115-128.
- Swain, M. (1983). Home-school language switching. In J.W. Oller Jr. & P.A. Richard-Amato (Eds.) *Methods That Work: A smorgasboard of Ideas for Language Teachers*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. & Burnaby, B. (1976). Personality characteristics and second language learning in young children: A pilot study. *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, 11, 115-128.
- Swain, M.K. & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.

- Trites, R.L. & Price, M.A. (1978). *Assessment of Reader Readiness for Primary French Immersion*. Ontario: Ministry of Education.
- Tucker, G.R. (1976). Affective, Cognitive, and social factors in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32, 214-226.

A Study of Composing in a First And a Second Language

MICHELE MORAGNE e SILVA

The past decade has seen extensive investigation in first language (L1) composing processes. As Zamel has stated, the importance of this research is based on the assumption that "before we know how to teach writing, we must first understand how we write" (1982, p. 196). Only recently has significant research been conducted, however, concerning the processes of composing in a second language (L2).

In order to establish a valid theoretical foundation for teaching ESL composition, much research of varying types is needed. Of the published studies examining adult second language writers, few have observed subjects also composing in their first language (Jones and Tetroe, 1987). Apparently it has been assumed that the way in which these writers compose in their L1 is either irrelevant or identical to their L2 composing. When considering unskilled L2 writers, however, one wonders if this lack of skill is a transfer from equally unskilled L1 composing, or if it is due to additional variables such as the nature of composing in an L2, individual fluency in the L2, familiarity of the writing task in either the L1 or L2, and rhetorical and content schemata that may be either L1- or L2-based.

Writing in an L1 is a complex act composed of cognitive, affective and socio-cultural domains (Rose, 1985); writing in an L2 may be considerably more complex. In an attempt to examine this complexity and the relationship between first and second language composing processes, a six month case study of one adult composing in his L1 and L2 was conducted. Although it is impossible to generalize from a single case study, an exploratory study such as this can help identify some aspects of L1 and L2 composing that merit future extensive investigation with numerous subjects.

Case Study of Composing in a First and Second Language

The research was begun with numerous exploratory questions. Are L1 and L2 composing processes the same for the subject in

responding to similar tasks? If not, how do they differ? What is the interaction of the L1 and L2 in these processes? How is the L1 used, if it is used, in L2 composing? Are there indications of its use in planning, reviewing or monitoring? Is the rhetorical problem viewed in terms of L1 or L2 knowledge and experience? Are planning and organizing dealt with according to L1 or L2 models?

Prior to observation it was hypothesized that overall writing strategies would be similar in L1 and L2, especially in problem representation, high-level goal creation and planning to achieve these goals, assuming that such strategies existed in the subject's L1 composing process. It was further hypothesized that differences might exist in the fulfillment of low-level goals, depending on the subject's fluency in English (his L2) and the extent to which his L2 low-level skills had become automatic.

Method. Two thinking-aloud protocols were collected from the subject composing in response to a writing task/prompt. The first data were collected in June, 1984, in his L2, English. The second were collected in December of the same year, in his L1, Portuguese. The data were collected on a tape recorder in his home. The English task took him approximately eighty minutes to complete, whereas the Portuguese task took approximately one hundred minutes. After each task, an informal interview about the task and his resulting composition took place.

The rationale for using a thinking-aloud protocol method of data collection follows Ericsson and Simon's (1980) discussion of the validity of this form of verbal reporting. A protocol is certainly not a definitive examination, but it is especially suitable for exploratory work such as this. Swarts, Flower and Hayes (1984) discuss the importance of protocol studies in composing process research. In addition, they discuss some of the limitations of this research, as have Odell, Goswami and Herrington (1983). Flower and Hayes' protocol research has been criticized by some, including Cooper and Holzman (1983).

Subject. Manuel, a native of Portugal, had been living in the United States for close to four years at the time of the first protocol. He had studied economics at a Portuguese university for three years prior to his arrival in this country. While in Portugal he had also studied English as a foreign language for roughly two years. He later transferred to an American college where he studied management for two years. At this college he was required to take

an intermediate course in writing ESL, a "freshman" composition course for foreign students, and business writing.

At the time of his English protocol, he had not written an academic composition for over a year. A few times a month he had written short business letters in English. At the time of his Portuguese protocol, Manuel estimated that he had not written an academic essay in Portuguese for five years, and since he has lived in the United States, he has written only informal letters in Portuguese.

Task. For each protocol Manuel was asked to write a composition in response to a task/prompt. In selecting appropriate prompts, there was a particular concern for topic control and validity of cross-analysis of data. It was necessary to use comparable topics that would still differ so that despite a six-month interim between protocols, the first task would not influence the second task. For this reason, two prompts were chosen that had been statistically shown to elicit comparable holistically-graded compositions in a study by Witte, Meyer, Cherry & Trachsel on native English speaking students (forthcoming). The L1 prompt asked the subject to write a composition discussing the role of education in American society. The L2 prompt asked him to discuss the role of money in our society.

Analysis of Data. All taped data from the protocols and interviews were transcribed. Later, the material was coded according to the basic processes of translating and reviewing and the subprocesses of generating, goal-setting, evaluating and revising as described by Flower and Hayes in their 1981 model of composing processes. Metacomments were noted, as well as the language in which they were spoken. Since "translation" is a potentially confusing term when working with bilingual subjects, the term "transcription" was used to describe the act of writing on paper and "translation" retained its traditional meaning.

As Swarts, Flower and Hayes (1984) emphasize, "there is no single, correct way to analyze protocols: one's method is ultimately determined by the task, the subjects, and the research questions to be answered" (1984, p.56). Therefore, the exploratory questions and hypotheses outlined above helped determine the method used in analyzing the protocols of this particular study. Flower and Hayes' (1981) model of cognitive processes in writing provided the basis for analysis of the protocols. In addition, various types of goal-

setting were analyzed according to those which reflected declarative or substantive knowledge and those which indicated procedural knowledge (Gagné, 1985), essentially distinguishing between content and structural schemata. Within procedural goals, goals which indicated process and those which emphasized structure of the writing task were further distinguished. In addition, both substantive and procedural goals were analyzed as either high-level (H), mid-level (M), or low-level (L). Appendices A, B, and C present sample data coded and analyzed according to this method.

Observations

Overview of composing process. The basic model of composing process evident in both of the subject's L1 and L2 protocols is a goals-to-text (Witte 1985) model, a term used to describe a process whereby a writer first generates ideas, then establishes goals, next generates more material and finally transcribes the text. Although some of his long generating episodes (evident in his L2 protocol) appear characteristic of a text-to-goals or "discovery" model, all of these episodes can be traced back to the initial generation of ideas and the structure of high-level goals. In his L1 protocol, once Manuel began transcribing text he rarely stopped to generate material or even revise. His few changes in processes after transcribing text were for reviewing within the paragraph he was writing. The marked difference in generating and transcribing in the L1 and L2 is evident from a word count of the two protocols and resulting compositions: L2 protocol = 4964 words, L2 composition = 480 words; L1 protocol = 2297 words, L1 composition = 778 words.

In both his L1 and L2, Manuel began transcribing notes from the outset, as soon as he had generated major points to discuss. This occurred after rereading/reviewing the L1 prompt, and immediately after the initial reading of the L2 prompt. In both languages he produced two different sets of notes: one of the initial ideas not used in the transcribed text, and another of specified ideas in phrases set up in a tentative outline format. These ideas were used, but the wording was changed upon transcription. The tentative outline established the overall structure of the essay. When he transcribed his L1 text, Manuel rarely referred back to his outline, notes or prompt. Most of the content, however, is contained in the outline and related directly to the prompt. This may be an indication of

Reviewing. Dissonance was perceived at high levels throughout generating and transcribing in both the L1 and L2. Only in his L2, however, did Manuel frequently review the prompt as an evaluation tool. When questioned about the absence of this in his L1 protocol, Manuel replied that the L1 prompt was straight-forward and was easy to remember, so he didn't need to review it often. Considering the statistical reliability of both prompts, the L1 and L2 seem to be the major variables here. This may be another indication of STM limitations when composing in the L2 - a difficulty of retaining new L2 information in working memory while thinking aloud and composing.

Low-level errors in his L1 composition were usually corrected at the point of utterance. Generally, Manuel paid little attention to low-level concerns, perhaps a sign of a skilled writer whose fundamental language skills have become fully automatic.

This lack of concern over low-level problems, when transferred into his L2 composing process, was actually detrimental at the final stages of completing his L2 task. Many errors, mainly Portuguese transfer errors, went by unnoticed during reviewing. At other times these same grammatical errors were revised at the point of utterance. Adverbs and adjectives were correctly revised in some spots but not in others. This may have been due more to carelessness than lack of ability in English since the L2 essay was actually left uncompleted and little time was spent rereading and editing. However, this may also indicate a lower frustration level in L2 composing. Manuel readily gave up at the end in creating a final perfect product. He was more interested in accomplishing his main goals, of solving the problem and writing his solution in a structured manner, than of producing a polished essay. We need to keep in mind, though, that the subject knew these essays would not be graded.

Conclusions

There are striking similarities between Manuel's L1 and L2 composing processes. His overall goals-to-text model is evident in composing in each language, and his initial problem representation and high-level goal structure is quite similar. Differences occur in the efficiency of attaining these goals.

Manuel had some difficulties in reaching his L2 high-level goals for a few reasons. First, most of his generated material was L1 knowledge which he literally translated during generation. At times

he was unable to translate concepts and this interrupted his composing process. He had strategies to solve these problems, such as writing a Portuguese word within quotation marks, asking the observer for a translation, or modifying his idea to fit known English terminology. Despite these helpful strategies, his train-of-thought was often disturbed and he had to review previously translated and/or generated material to re-establish high-level goals.

Secondly, some low-level skills were not fully automatic in his L2. This created problems in reviewing and revising, but most importantly, in occupying working memory and preventing full concentration on higher goals. It is quite possible that the act of talking aloud created additional demands on working memory when English oral skills were not automatic. This is an important area to investigate, especially if researchers continue to use the valuable research tool of thinking-aloud protocol analysis in investigating L2 composing processes.

Third, there is evidence that Manuel associated closely the L2 topic with L1 knowledge and had difficulties in structuring the knowledge in an acceptable L2 format. He sensed that his natural narrative pattern was inappropriate, and, therefore, he needed to consciously restructure narrative generated material into an expository structure.

Still, one cannot consider Manuel a basic or novice writer in his L2. He is not preoccupied with low-level problems at the expense of higher-level goals. Similarly, he is not bound by grammatical rules like some ESL students are. He is able to go beyond these rules to use language as a generative means of composing. Other characteristics separate Manuel's L2 protocol from that of a novice writer: The task is constructed and represented easily, high-level goals are constructed and retained throughout, mid-level goals are created and used in production to reach high-level goals, and the produced text is evaluated frequently against intentions. It is clear that the assessment of a basic writer is put here in terms of process, not written product. Raimes (1985: 231-2) discusses the problems and inconsistencies of various researchers in defining basic or unskilled writers. Any comparisons made among studies need to distinguish clearly between assessment of writers' skills through process or product.

Few generalizations should be drawn from this study of one individual composing in a first and second language to L2 adult composers as a whole. Tremendous individual differences can exist in degree of L2 fluency and L1 writing skills. This study does,

however, indicate that additional research is greatly needed in observing L2 composing processes. Only by examining composers of varying degrees of L2 acquisition, may we begin to understand the relationship between L1 and L2 composing processes.

REFERENCES

- Bracewell, R., Frederiksen, C. H. & Frederiksen, J. D. . 1982. Cognitive processes in composing and comprehending discourse. *Educational Psychologist* , 17, 46-64.
- Cook, M. 1985. The relation of first and second language writing: A study of essays written in Spanish and English by Hispanic foreign graduate students. Paper presented at the 19th Annual TESOL Convention, NYC, April, 1985.
- Edelsky, C. 1982. Writing in a bilingual program: The relation of L1 and L2 texts. *TESOL Quarterly* , 16, 211-28.
- Ericsson, K. A. & Simon, H. A. 1980. Verbal reports as data. *Psychological Review*, 87, 215-51.
- Ericsson, K. A. & Simon, H. A. . 1984. *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Flower, L. & Hayes, J. R. . 1981. A cognitive theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-87.
- Gagné, E. 1985. *The cognitive psychology of school learning*. Little, Brown and Company.
- Gaskill, W. 1985. Composing in Spanish and English: Focus on revision. Paper presented at the 19th Annual TESOL Convention, NYC, April, 1985.
- Jones, S and Tetroe, J. . 1987. Composing in a Second Language. In A. Matsushashi (Ed.), *Writing in Real Time: Modeling the Production Process*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Kaplan, R B. 1966. Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-20.
- Kaplan, R B. 1982. An introduction to the study of written texts: The "discourse compact". In Robert B Kaplan (Ed.), *Annual review of applied linguistics*, vol. 3.
- Odell, L., D. Goswami & Herrington, A. . 1983. The discourse-based interview: A procedure for exploring the tacit knowledge of writers in non-academic settings. In P. Mosenenthal, L. Tamor & S. A. Walmsly (Eds.), *Research on writing: Principles and methods*. New York: Longman.

- Perl, S. 1979. The composing processes of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 13, 317-36.
- Raimes, A. 1983. Anguish as a second language? Remedies for composition teachers. In A. Freedman, I. Pringle & J. Yalden (Eds.), *Learning to write: First language/second language*. New York: Longman.
- Raimes, A. 1985. What unskilled ESL Students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 229-58.
- Rose, M. 1985. Complexity, rigor, evolving method, and the puzzle of writer's block. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write: Studies in writers' block and other composing process problems*. New York: Guilford.
- Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C. & Goelman, H. . 1982. The role of production factors in writing ability. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *What writers know: The language, process, and structure of written discourse*. New York: Academic.
- Sommers, N. 1980. Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 31, 378-88.
- Swarts H., Flower, L. & Hayes, J. R. . 1984. Designing protocol studies of the writing process: An introduction. In R. Beach & L. Bridwell (Eds.), *New directions in composition research*. New York: Guilford.
- Witte, S. 1985. Revising composing theory and research design. In S. W. Friedman (Ed.), *The Acquisition of written language: Response and revision*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Witte, S. 1987. Pretext and composing. *College Composition and Communication*, 38, 4:397-425.
- Witte, S. & Cherry, R. . 1986. Writing processes and written products in composition research. In Cooper & Greenbaum (Eds.), *Studying writing: Linguistic approaches*. Vol. 1 of *Written Communication Annual: An international survey of research and theory*.
- Witte, S., Meyer, P., Cherry, R., & Trachsel, M. Forthcoming. *Holistic assessment of writing: Issues and theory in practice*. New York: Guilford.
- Zamel, V. 1976. Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10, 67-76.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 195-209.

- Zamel, V. 1983. The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 165-87.

Appendix A

English Translation of L1 protocol

Key

/ slashes /	Thought segment
<u>Underline</u>	Transcribed material
<i>Italics</i>	Reading of text

Capital Letters Appearing Above Text

L	Low	PPG	Procedural Process goal
M	Mid	PSG	Procedural Structure Goal
H	High	SG	Substantive Goal

... How would it be seen, what would be the best manner to make
 LPPG HSG & LPPG
 one, to briefly write something, / the best way of organizing to do
 something quickly, that does not take a long time ... yes, what is the
 LPPG
 best way. / I think I am going to write several things .../ The title,
 HSG
 really, the role of education in the American society. / The role of
education in the American society. / It is very clear in the text that
 when they refer to education in the American society, they refer to
 institutional education, to the education in the school, / it doesn't
 HSG
 refer to education in the family, the moral education, that depends on
 the society in general, in the school, in the institutions... .../ The
 role of education in the American society. / Several things. / It is
 HSG
 important to make a historic reference. / In the text presented, it

refers to the forefathers of this country. / The forefathers,... / of
the fatherland refer to it is referring to Washington, Jefferson, ... the
founders / Washington, Jefferson, / and others, Adams. / No, it is
Meta LSG LSG
not important the name, / it is important. / Was it not Jefferson that
was very ingenious, that wrote books about aspects of small
inventions, or something like that.../ ...It is true that since the
foundation of the United States ... there is a great mixture of people
who came from many different places, / they came here, / because in
Europe there was not freedom to do everything one wanted to do. /
In Europe, one had to do in accordance with what the ruling parties
accepted, / if one was not on the side of the government, they
would become, / but, if one was not accepted /then, the people
came here, where they had the freedom to develop the inventions
they wanted to make. / In the beginning there were not many rules,
/ then, the people were making them ... / Then [the country] grew
... / and in the East, ... in the East of the United States, New York,
... / in that area it became more organized, it starts to exist ... / then
they took advantage of technology that was used in Europe, / the
Industrial Revolution in England ... the people that came here used
the same methods ... /only that they didn't have the same, ... they
were not under a social organization like that one in England. /

There was more freedom to pay what they wanted, / really, the
relationships of labor and money, of capital. / ^{rereads prompt} *The forefathers'* ...
... / Many schools were founded, / many schools were founded,
schools, institutions, universities, many institutions, ... many
schools were / founded last century. / ... But many of the
innovations, ... many of the innovations appeared outside of the
school. / They appeared from people that were ingenious. /

Appendix B

English Translation of L1 Protocol

(Refer to key in Appendix A.)

... The role of education in the American society. / What would be
MSPG
the best way to make an introduction / .../ ...for many people, / ...
For many people history may seem a little / but ... in the United
States of the North America they prove ... that really ... it is not
only
very ... / it is really enormous ... / 'it is really enormous ' .../
(rereads what just wrote) ... / Since the forefathers, .../ I am
referring to the politicians who worked for the independence of this
LPPG
nation. / (rereads phrase) ... / the people / ... how can I say that ... /
Meta
the people ... / the people / had ... / humm ... / have education, /
LPPG Meta
how can I say it? ... / (rereads phrase)/ ... O.K. / the people ... /
always had the freedom of doing what they wanted, / how they
wanted it, / to experiment new inventions, educate themselves / and
revises
to educate / ... and finally / to educate / the population in
MPSG & MSG
general. / It is not placed in the best way but I don't know ... / It is
possible to divide ... / It is possible to make reference to perhaps
three aspects, or divisions to observe better/ the process how the
Americans have acquired formal knowledge, ... / First it is to refer

to the historic development of the country / and the / the / its senses /
as / like a human being, / in becoming more educated. / Another
aspect will be / or would be ... / the role of society, that is / i.e.,
LPSG Meta
institutions or groups and the education. / Third, / no ... / Another
one refers to the individual and education. / Firstly, It was the
individuality to experiment making inventions, / to express without
the barriers that some have found / when they lived in Europe. /
This is more / evident, or particularly / particularly evident in the
example of Thomas Jefferson. / the ingenious and inventive
president. / (rereads sentence after tape is turned over) / But it
continues during the nineteenth century, / there were always
inventors, / some came from Europe / others were born in America,
/ It is possible to find great names such as Ben / Benjamin / Franklin
/ and others / and others / ... / This continues in the twentieth
century, / twentieth / first those that had a better economic situation
were enrolled in some of the few universities in the East. / Today
these universities are the pride of the United States in the role that
they (universities) had in participating in the development of this
country. / All Americans know names such as Harvard, Yale,
Columbia, etc., / (whistles a little) ...

Appendix C

English (L2) Protocol

(Refer to key in Appendix A)

And this is a basic concept of value here that is the basis of money today. / And this goes on, and there are several different places in the world where people try to have instead of carrying these gigantic things around -- one little thing is O.K., but when it gets to trading of several large things and as people produce more and more things get larger-- and to change these things people decided to have some kind of money printed like Carlos Magnum and uhh.../ Carlos Magnum issued coins with his face on and symbols or somehow... / and they had an assumed value. / And they were traded by things. / And people don't lose coins that have some value for trade./ They were easy to carry./ One of the objectives was that they were easy to carry. / Due to the need of keeping those coins in shape, they had a tendency to use silver or gold as the substance to make the coins. / They are scarce. / But in the beginning it is more because they keep their shape and since they are scarce, it would be harder to replace them and they for awhile they get their value almost from what is put into the coins. / And it had been that for a long time, several centuries it was that way. / Gold and silver were the basis of the

currencies of all of the countries until they knew that gold should be the moeda padrão. / So, this explains equivalente geral. / It's not easy in English in a short time. / *Money and theory of value.* / Uhh ... there is a relationship here. / There is theory of value. / There are several definitions but what is the value of something is a question that we can ask. / The value of things. / We have to go farther and see the overall picture of the value of one thing because as we saw, the value of a knife and a sheep to be traded depends on the person. / But when converted to money those things... there is ... if I knew or if I had more surplus that I wanted to sell, there is some market idea involving this. / But that would be the valor do HSG mercado. / But we should go to the essence of the thing. / How long it will take to do it, what kind of work we need to do it, / we HSG HPSG should go back and try to get a dictionary definition to start / and value is the quantum -- is the amount -- of the work needed to make objects, to make a product. / And that product translates into that value. / But it would be the average, the world average work needed to make that product that would translate the value. / It would be very hard to calculate but it would be in essence what it should be. / And the problem since today we have international trade, it would not be necessary to calculate in terms of a number, but if the trade

becomes fair and the product gets access .../ I don't know how to
say /... accessible .../ if the products reach the people / that knew
that product, the market value and value should not have a big gap.
/ And this is shaping .../ we are going to see that this has a larger
impact in shaping society because the quantum of work./...O.K..
LPPG MSG
Let's write a few things here. / So the topic is pretty well known. /
MSG
We'll have money as the equivalente geral./ Money as equivalente
geral. / So.../ objects of merchandise are converted into metal and
later this money owned by a person is going to convert again into
merchandise. / Let's see an example. / Let's suppose you make
hats. / You sell your hats. / You get money for them. / With that, /
with this / money you can acquire other things you need such as
food, clothes, etc. / So, money was... / *thus money was in
between.* / Was, / it was / the equivalente for your trade. / This
money as an equivalente geral issued by the central bank in the
USA, the Fed govern/ment, Fed Reserve or Federal Reserve, / let's
see/... this money as an equivalente geral issued by the central
government, the central government here in the US, the Fed /
Reserve plays a broad role. / That is the equivalente geral. / Is/ it is
the thing that people use to measure value of other things when they
trade, / when they are traded, they / are traded. / We have this .../
MPPG

let's go check this question the page in the blue print.../ how is money valued compared to the way other things are valued?/

Meta

Uhh.../ in other weres, / other words / not weres, / money was in the past valued similar as other things were. / But through the years separate itself from those things. / O.K./ Let me write a little bit

Meta

Meta

more and then I'll stop. / Come on./ O.K./ I don't know where I was. / Intervalo. Intervalo. / Let's see. / *In other words, money*

Meta

was in the past valued similar .../ similar-ly.../ as other things were but through the years sepa/rated / itself from those things.../ thus money appears today to people. / No, that / *appears today / as something different than other things are.* / *In fact, money is different although once was similar and was, / it was / should be, / it was / originated from a need of comparing things with the purpose of trading things.* / Not a big composition yet but it's not bad. / Let's see. / This explains already equivalente geral from some point of view, historic point of view, / and although could be written a lot more, / I think I could stop here for now and just check on our third point. / My third point relates with umm...

How Is Language Possible?

Jagdish N. Hattiangadi. LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Co., 1987.

Jagdish N. Hattiangadi has done what few analytic philosophers have tried to do: He has integrated analytic work on specific problems in the philosophy of language into a general theory of the origin and nature of language. The result of this attempt to see the forest instead of the trees is *How is Language Possible?*, a rich discussion of the nature of meaning and the role of evolution in a philosophical account of language.

The author rightly disclaims any particular originality for his specific conclusions; rather, he has attempted an original synthesis of the insights of contemporary linguistic philosophers and scientists. In a wide-ranging but well-organized discussion, Hattiangadi discusses virtually every major twentieth century Anglo-American philosopher of language and logic, as well as the neo-Darwinist evolutionary theories of Konrad Lorenz, J. H. Greenberg, and K. von Frisch. The author's thesis is that neo-Darwinist evolutionary theory solves and dissolves problems in the philosophy of language and explains the genesis and perpetuation of language. Because of the wide scope of the discussion, the primary audience for the book is a reader who, having some understanding of either linguistics, the philosophy of language or evolution, seeks a high-level introductory survey to selected problems in analytic philosophy of language. Since the book argues a unified interdisciplinary thesis, enthusiasts and sophisticated practitioners of any of the disciplines mentioned above will probably enjoy this book.

Professor Hattiangadi begins by addressing four major philosophical questions: How can language be perpetuated? How can it change? How can different individuals learn the same language? What is the relationship between language and reality? The answers to these questions require both a general theory of linguistic meaning and a theory of human behavior which explains how and why human organisms would initiate and perpetuate language.

The author argues that the meaning of a word is neither its referent nor an ideal meaning, but a set of theories. A theory is roughly a set of belief statements which use the word meaningfully. The logical form of these statements is the subjunctive conditional, an if-then statement in the subjunctive mood. The notation (x) (Fx -

-> x) is adopted for the subjunctive conditional. Theories can be explicated in terms of a set of logically coherent and relevant expansion sentences. For example, expansion sentences for the word "red" include: a) (x) (Rx --> x is not blue); b) (x) (Rx --> x appears blue when viewed through yellow sunglasses). The meaning of a word is not limited to those expansion sentences which we are aware of: "One can and often does discover expansion sentences that one did not even realize one believed (p. 45). Linguistic change is then explained as the confrontation of logically incompatible theories. Professor Hattiangadi believes that as conflicts over the truth of expansion sentences are resolved there is a progressive trend toward increasingly articulate meanings and, *a fortiori*, theories about the world.

While this is the main line of Dr. Hattiangadi's argument, many important details and logical insights are necessarily here omitted. For example, the author considers possible world approaches to the problem of the truth functionality of subjunctive conditionals. Since his meanings are like Fregean senses, he also assumes the burden of showing how sense (meaning) can lead to reference. The author also argues that "loose synonymy" and "loose analyticity" are adequate for a theory of knowledge and language.

Hattiangadi's theory of meaning is interesting for several reasons. In his view, the meaning of a word can include false beliefs and thus the author can provide a convincing explanation of misunderstanding. Genuine understanding turns out to be an open-ended competition among meanings/theories. This introduces a progressive teleology (also necessary for the evolutionary thesis) into linguistic behavior, which leads the author to conclude, for instance, that if Einstein is right about space and time then ordinary language is obsolete. This conclusion seems neither a necessary consequence of Dr. Hattiangadi's views nor right-headed. A good theory of meaning should account for the meaningfulness of mutually incompatible ways of speaking. On the one hand, the author needs to submit expansion sentences to the rule of logical analysis in order to explain how the meaning of a proposition refers to the world and to show how the scientific knowledge embodied in language fulfills an evolutionary function. But on the other hand, the author recognizes that linguistic experience is not in fact characterized by such logical criteria. Language can be meaningful without achieving an objective reference. Of course, Professor Hattiangadi is not the first philosopher of language to arrive at this familiar juncture between describing the nature of language and

prescribing its improvement under the tutelage of logic and the physical sciences.

The same problem arises when Dr. Hattiangadi tries to explain what it means for a language to become "more articulate" or to increase its "expressive capabilities." He identifies expressive capability with a mastery of the conventions of the language. Certainly some will want to argue that language becomes more expressive in precisely the opposite way, when speakers flout the conventions of direct discourse to produce catachresis, metaphor, irony, etc. The scientific ideal of precision and logical coherence probably does not account for the progress of scientific discourse, but some readers will feel that an account of the nature of language has been displaced by the nature of scientific and logical discourse, with which it is by no means co-extensive. Whatever one's feelings about these larger issues, *How is Language Possible?* provides a good background for discussion.

The most speculative and engaging discussions come in the latter chapters of the book where the author argues that neo-Darwinist evolutionary theory explains the original motivation for language as well as its perpetuation. Theories are very general ways of responding to problems presented by the environment. Stereotyped patterns of understanding comprise a "proto-language" analogous to Konrad's stereotyped motor patterns. In other words, the explanations we give of the world are patterned or styled on previous explanations the same way complex physical movements represent acquired motor patterns based on simpler movements. While the ultimate physical evidence of these patterns is genetic, a behavioral explanation shows how prelinguistic problem-solving could be a part of a naturalistic account of language. The other behavioral component is the imitative play of children, which the author discusses much later in the book. While these two components are not explicitly related, Dr. Hattiangadi seems to think of language as a combination of strict problem-solving and free play.

Of course, students of evolutionary linguistics will not find this thesis terribly original, but the author only claims to bring out some philosophical implications of new theories of evolution. Trigger-release theories, for example, show that organisms respond to stimuli with complete routines of behavior that are more complex than our perceptions. In other words, it doesn't make sense to think of the complex activities of an athlete as calculated responses - at every moment of the action - to the environment. Classical

philosophical empiricism, even in the late nineteenth century, considered stimulus and response in virtual one-to-one correspondence over time. Hattiangadi argues persuasively that empiricists are not committed to explaining knowledge simply on the basis of perception. Philosophers will find Dr. Hattiangadi's criticisms of Gilbert Ryle's distinction between "knowing that" and "knowing how" particularly interesting in this connection.

Given the wide scope of the discussions (short chapters have titles such as, "Mind and the Origin of Language," and "Essence versus Evolution in Language"), it is inevitable that the author will pass too lightly over highly disputed questions, but this is just a price worth paying to present a comprehensive view. For instance, he regards baby language as a completely distinct language and uses this "fact" as evidence for the revolutionary character of linguistic development. I think many linguists would dispute this claim, arguing that the completeness or distinctness of syntactic rules in baby language is not evidence against the claim that adult language is a continuous development from baby language.

The thesis that evolutionary selection pressures motivate language is argued on two fronts: First, theories of human behavior - specifically play and imitation - can account for the natural genesis of language in human society; second, genetic theory shows how information transfers at the biological level can form a kind of proto-language of which human language is the self-conscious development. Even in the short space of the book these two approaches are developed in impressive detail. Here it will suffice to make a remark about each to indicate the *kinds* of issues raised by the discussion.

On the level of human behavior, language has its origin in the imitative play of children. The ability to make fictions, to regard the world as an "as if" structure, has survival value according to Dr. Hattiangadi. This scientific explanation makes sense, yet a philosopher will still ask, "Why do we have the ability?" and "Doesn't this 'as if' structure presuppose an ability to regard one thing (a signifier) as something which it is not (a signified)?" If so, language ability is already presupposed at the level of play. The philosophy of language is possible only if it makes sense to ask questions such as these about the presuppositions of scientific explanatory frameworks.

On the level of microbiology, we are all rightly fascinated by the apparent "linguistic" structure of the double helix. Transfer RNA "reads" DNA to build proteins from which, in turn, RNA is

composed. But what do these metaphors explain about language? One commission of philosophers of language is to determine how and when we are abused by such metaphors. A large and relevant philosophical question is not discussed in this book: Is a naturalistic explanation of language adequate to resolve philosophical questions about language?

Dr. Hattiangadi describes his book as "an attempt to rescue language from philosophy (xvii)." Philosophers and linguists alike will wish him success, the latter to pursue the scientific study of language and the former to be rid of some tedious and intractable problems. For better or worse (and I think for better), the rescue does not take place. The rich, engaging texture of this book shows us that the piecemeal answers of the analytic tradition do have to be synthesized and related to the work of scientists. When this is done, the philosophical issues stand out brilliantly. But then we are only at the beginning of the philosophy of language. Ironically, *How is Language Possible?* doubles our interest in precisely those philosophical questions it tries to settle.

MARK ALFINO

The Social Construction of Literacy

Edited by Jenny Cook-Gumperz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. Pp. 248.

Education theorists have come a long way since suggesting that the problems of minority students in acquiring literacy were caused by their linguistic and cognitive deficiency (cf. Bereiter and Engleman, 1966). Of the many voices that rose to challenge this questionable notion, sociolinguists have been in the forefront. Labov (1972) was the first to scientifically point out that Black English Vernacular (BEV), although a different dialect, was as rule governed, complex and systematic as "Standard English." He posited a "difference" theory against the biased "deficit" explanation. Since Labov, sociolinguists have presented many fascinating theoretical and methodological approaches which survey the difference between the discourse of minorities and the mainstream community. *The Social Construction of Literacy*, edited by Jenny Cook-Gumperz, introduces still another insightful perspective to literacy, as influenced by John Gumperz' (1982) model of Interactional Sociolinguistics.

In this text, the Gumperzes apply to education the research they have been carrying out in the area of inter-ethnic communication in urban environments using their own sociolinguistic model (cf. Gumperz, 1982). In a polemical paper, "Interactional Sociolinguistics in the Study of Schooling" (pp. 45-68), John Gumperz offers a theoretical basis to the studies collected in this book. It is clear that Gumperz considers his own approach to literacy superior to some of the other models developed by sociolinguists. Before judging this claim, it is first important to see how the approach differs from the others so that we might situate the book within the current scholarship and also understand its contribution.

Labov's contribution was to show that minority students possess a diverse dialect not accepted by educational institutions and that this contributes to their being considered illiterate. He also pointed out that white, middle-class teachers were prejudiced against users of this dialect, which caused the failure of minority students and resulted in a self-fulfilling prophecy. Though these observations are certainly true, they do not go far enough. Gumperz points out that most black youth are bi-dialectals, switching between the standard and the vernacular according to context. Furthermore, if dialect difference is the only reason for the failure of minority

students, it could also be asked how it is that foreign students as well as Asian immigrants perform well in western schools, while their languages differ more from English than does BEV

Ethnographers of communication, following Dell Hymes' (1980) model, explain that it is not so much grammatical difference as discourse difference that matters. That is, BEV is informed by a set of cultural values and conventions of communication which are not accepted by the school as "literate" verbal behavior. Studies influenced by this model survey the differences in discourse between home and school, oral language and literate language, native community and public institutions. Shirley Brice Heath's *Ways with Words* (1983) is one of the finest studies in this tradition, stemming from a laborious participant observation of black and white communities in the Piedmont Carolinas for ten years. But Gumperz is dissatisfied with this premise as well, because it artificially compartmentalizes the linguistic interaction into separate entities (such as code, channel, topic, and setting) and places itself at a distance from the face-to-face interaction of communicants. In this respect, it is similar to Labovian Correlational Linguistics which also abstracts verbal interaction into separate variables such as sex, class and grammatical elements.

Gumperz, like Conversation Analysts influenced by the sociological tradition of Ethnomethodology, prefers to stick close to the verbal interaction, analyzing how speakers negotiate the communicative act and jointly achieve information transfer in the minute temporal flow of speech. But his Interactional Sociolinguistics departs from Conversation Analysis considerably by taking into account linguistic elements and also acknowledging the function of socio-cultural background in the study of verbal interaction. In this volume, Gumperz proposes that we study the verbal interaction between the teacher and students in the schools, since it is through these channels that different ideologies of education and cultural assumptions are communicated. He feels it is important to see how knowledge is transmitted in the classroom and the different problems that arise when teachers and students bring different conventions to verbal interaction.

Gordon Wells' "The Language Experience of Five-Year-Old Children at Home and at School" (pp. 69-93), a study conducted in Bristol, illustrates this approach quite well. Through a longitudinal study using radio-microphones worn by children at home and school, Wells statistically analyzes the comparative frequency of children's utterances to adults and vice versa (under the categories of

turns per sequence, syntactical complexity, turn initiation, and speech acts such as questions, requests and references beyond here and now). Wells demonstrates that in each case the school not only stifles the linguistic development of the child, but also fails to provide an environment to at least develop the verbal repertoire acquired at home. The "hidden curriculum" communicated to the children is that "schools are places where [the children's] individual initiative in thinking and speaking is disvalued, where the asking of questions is to be left to the teacher, and where the best answer is short and preferably expressed in exactly the words that the teacher already has in mind" (p. 90).

In another interesting study, "Speaking and Writing: Discourse Strategies and the Acquisition of Literacy" (pp. 207-222), James Collins and Sarah Michaels demonstrate the considerable misunderstanding that occurs when a Caucasian teacher is unable to understand the communicative cues of black students. The study goes on to show that the transition from oral language to literate language is much smoother for Caucasian children than for black children because of the communicative conventions and grammatical structures they bring from their respective homes. The study confirms the earlier finding of Bernstein (1971) that white, middle-class children enjoy an unfair advantage over the black, working-class children in acquiring literacy. The authors do not, however, share the determinism and pejorative connotations associated with Bernstein's terminology-- "elaborated code" and "restricted code."

People who find the book attractive by virtue of the term "social construction" in the title may be disappointed. Since Social Construction approaches are fashionable these days and are being productively applied to the teaching of writing (cf. Bruffee, 1983; Faigley, 1986), it is only natural that readers expect the book to be influenced by this approach. While Cook-Gumperz's introductory chapters occasionally smack of deconstructionist jargon, the studies collected here show very little influence from the deconstructionist school. Social Constructionists believe that we belong to different discourse communities which not only have different conventions of communication, but different world views. Since it is language that embodies our different ideological assumptions, knowledge of the respective languages would mark our membership in different discourse communities. The problem for minority students in acquiring literacy is one of trying to join an alien discourse community whose communicative styles and ideologies are different than theirs. Since they do not possess the language of the intellectual

community, the minority youth are prevented from joining it (cf. Bizzell, 1982).

A fine illustration of the social constructionist perspective to literacy (and, in fact, the only one in this collection) is Douglas Campbell's "Developing Mathematical Literacy in a Bilingual Classroom" (pp. 156-84)--a study made in a Philipino secondary school. Though it initially appears that the Philipino teacher is mistakenly teaching English in a math class, Campbell demonstrates by way of a detailed analysis of the conversational interaction that learning the code language is integral to the performance and comprehension of mathematical skills. It is only after they become familiar with the domain of discourse that students become capable of doing math. The fact that it is a bilingual class makes this point all the more pervasive--that "language is not merely the 'medium' of instruction but also its essential point, even in officially non-language areas such as mathematics" (p.182). Campbell insists this applies to monolingual classes as well.

As exemplified in the above study, the editors ensure that the collection represents surveys in a variety of settings (including Britain, Philippines and mid-western United States), though the majority of studies are from a two-year investigation of an ethnically mixed Northern California school system funded by the US National Institute of Education. The methodologies applied also represent a healthy mixture. Conversation Analysis carried out with a fine-grained linguistic perspective is complemented with detailed participant observation (as in the studies of Collins and Michaels [pp. 207-222]). Similarly, close analyses of conversational routines and adjacency pairs in an Ethnomethodological vein are complemented by Labovian correlation analyses (as in Wells' study [pp. 69-93]).

Though the book may disappoint some by not providing the social constructionist approach to literacy promised in the title, it does provide further insight into the cultural problems of acquiring literacy from a social interactional point of view. Also, rather than confirming any claims of superiority of any one sociolinguistic method over another, the studies collected here indicate that illuminating perspectives on literacy can emerge if diverse methodologies are used in a complementary manner.

REFERENCES

- Bereiter, C., and Engleman, S. (1966). *Teaching disadvantaged children in the pre-school*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bernstein, Basil. (1971). *Class, codes and control* (Vol 1). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bizzell, Patricia. (1982). Cognition, convention and certainty: What we need to know about writing. *PRE/TEXT*, 3, 213-43.
- Bruffee, Kenneth. (1983). Writing and reading as collaborative or social acts: The argument from Kuhn and Vygotsky. In J. N. Hayes (Ed.) *The writer's mind: Writing as a mode of thinking*. Urbana: NCTE.
- Faigley, Lester. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and a proposal. *College English*, 48, 527-42.
- Gumperz, John J. Ed. (1982). *Language and social identity*. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Heath, Shirley Brice. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Hymes, Dell. (1980). *Language in education: Ethnolinguistic essays*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. (1972). The logic of non-standard English. *Language in the inner-city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 354-396.

SURESH CANAGARAJAH

Frontiers: An Active Introduction to English Grammar.
John Schmidt and Terry Simon. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
Publishing Company, 1988. Student Text: pp. 324.

Frontiers is a large red book with a soft cover showing a spacecraft blasting off from some dark planet. Behind the rocket are 324 pages of black and white, tightly-spaced displays of words, sentences, dialogs, charts, boldfaced titles, and occasional pictures--an assembly designed to propel prospective English-speakers into the study of their new language.

The thought of learning intensive grammar from the outset of one's language study is an intimidating prospect for both student and teacher. Therefore, it would not be surprising to find ESL students who were somewhat overwhelmed by an initial skimming of *Frontiers'* fat chapters and colorless interior. Yet, through careful examination of the text, one recognizes that Schmidt and Simon may have anticipated their text's intimidating skeleton and made strong endeavors in their organization to soften the initial jolt. In order for the student to familiarize him or herself with the text's personality, each of the 12 chapters features a similar format, beginning with a very impressive pencil sketch drawing, and followed by anywhere from 19 to 40 brief exercises which cover grammar related to the initial dialog or subsequent dialogs. Following this parade of grammar drills is a two-part subdivision consisting of an activities phase--including role play, cloze-style exercises, guessing games, and dictations--and a two-part review quiz--which resembles the listening comprehension and the structure and written expression sections of the TOEFL exam. Also included are a teacher's guide and cassette series for listening portions.

Schmidt and Simon seem to have written *Frontiers* with the goal of helping students internalize "good" English from the outset of their study by using the four language skills--listening, speaking, reading, and writing--as tools. If all goes well, the student, upon completion of the text, may be at a proficiency level which resembles some portion of the intermediate spectrum of the ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines for English. The authors have geared the vocabulary and subject matter in their dialogs in toward helping students survive ably in American English, emphasizing basic survival needs and social demands, such as getting from one place to another, talking about time, buying, and eating. Students should also be able to initiate simple conversations about work,

school, family and friends, food, TV, or weather by the time they finish this text.

Of primary importance in evaluating any text is its relevance to student needs; one must measure a text by how well it focuses on conditions students require to most successfully learn English. Therefore, it is appropriate to judge this text by considering Rubin's learner strategies (1975), a list which presents conclusions from research investigating what students do in order to become successful language learners. This review wages the contents of *Frontiers* against six of Rubin's seven strategies (number 2 is left out).

1. The good language learner is a willing and accurate guesser.

Frontiers does not insult a student's intelligence. The text provides contexts where the student must make an appropriate choice in a cloze test format, collections of words which need to be arranged by the student in a specified grammatical format, and riddles such as "You can take off my skin. I won't cry, but you will. What am I?".

3. The good language learner is often not inhibited. He is willing to appear foolish if reasonable communication results. He is willing to make mistakes in order to learn and to communicate. He is willing to live with a certain amount of vagueness.

No textbook can eliminate qualms about learning another language. However, *Frontiers* does make an effort to calm any potential nervousness by refraining from overloading students with material. The text does not demand that the student learn each exercise with 100 percent precision. Instead, the book is written by slowly adding bulk to grammar rules, incorporating at simple levels previous lessons in newer and slightly more challenging exercises. For example, irregular past tense verbs are presented over four chapters, never using more than 16 new verbs in a chapter, but always subtly reiterating those verbs already learned. The presentation of grammar and vocabulary is never imposing, and always has pictures, charts, or dialogs as referents.

Of course, the teacher will have to take some responsibility in easing student inhibitions. Although the vocabulary and subject

matter are never overwhelming, the student's motivation may be diminished by the initial prospect of completing up to 40 exercises and synthesizing an uninviting queue of charts, formulas, and terminology. The teacher may need to alleviate such false inhibitions by choosing only several exercises from a chapter and creating relevant supplementary material. At the very least, the teacher will want to remind students that the exercises are very short, usually eight to twelve items per exercise, that the level of difficulty successfully increases at a steady rate within the text, and that finishing the book is not the ultimate goal--understanding is. No one should be in a hurry to get through this book.

4. In addition to focussing on communication, the good language learner is prepared to attend to form. The good language learner is constantly looking for patterns in the language.

The word "grammar" appears in the book's title. Although the authors state that grammar may be learned inductively in this text--thereby suggesting that teachers who don't want to spend time with linguistic terminology might successfully use this book--it is somewhat difficult to accept that a book in which all of the exercises bear titles like "Present Continuous: Negative Statements" or "Non-count Nouns and Plural Count Nouns" would be attractive to a teacher who dislikes talking about language. The same holds true for the students. This book is for those who wish to fine-tune their English from the moment they begin to study. Text vocabulary and review quizzes are designed to prepare those who might eventually want to take the TOEFL, an exam designed around details as well as collegiate and business language. It is not a manual for those who wish to visit the US for a couple of weeks and simply get on and off airplanes. This book is for students who wish to speak English in some official capacity, either in an academic or a business setting.

The text also concentrates on pronunciation by presenting listening drills covering ordered pairs or clusters in order to give students listening and speaking practice over common problem sounds. The pronunciation exercises are not extensive, but they do introduce students to pronunciations to which they may need to pay some attention.

5. *The good language learner practices.*

As has already been mentioned, the student receives plenty of opportunities to practice while using this book. The text includes over 300 exercises to be accomplished in class in addition to review quizzes, activities, and in-class discussion about subjects raised by the text.

A good text should give students practice in different types of work (Daoud and Celce-Murcia, 1979). *Frontiers* succeeds in providing opportunities for practice in all four language skills. Listening is covered in the pronunciation and mini-conversation exercises by the use of supplementary cassettes. There are several points in the text where the student is asked to write a small essay or dictation. Speaking is generated in interviews as well as class discussion. It is through the interviews that students gain the best practice in creating language: the text includes both interview exercises which help the students with the form of the question and those which involve blanks for the interviewer to fill in. Of course, the answers are completely generated by the person being interviewed. Reading is a constantly practiced skill, beginning with the lengthy dialogs which use everyday language and common word order.

6. *The good language learner monitors his own and the speech of others. That is, he is constantly attending to how well his speech is being received and whether his performance meets the standards he has learned.*

One shortcoming of this text is that it does not provide many opportunities for the student to scrutinize his or her own performance. The student has to monitor work based almost solely on commentary from the teacher. In fact, if *Frontiers* were a car, the teacher would be the ignition key: this text cannot function without an involved teacher. All quizzes, tests, and dictations are corrected by the teacher. Apart from the teacher's comments, students gauge their pronunciation and listening against the cassettes provided in the class. While there are many pairwork exercises (mini-conversations, interviews, and role plays) the vocabulary and the subject matter are directed by the text and corrected by the teacher. Since information travels to the student either from the

book or teacher, the class might become overly teacher-dominated. The teacher may find relief in initiating classroom discussion through use of the pencil sketches provided at the beginning of each chapter or the riddles in the activities sections.

7. *The good language learner attends to meaning. He knows that in order to understand the message, it is not sufficient to pay attention to the grammar of the language or to the surface form of speech.*

How does a text allow for a student to attend to meaning? One way is by invigorating the student with the use of some graphic or ludicrous imagery (Cohen, 1987). *Frontiers* attempts to excite the student through the initial dialogs of each chapter. First, there is an intricate pencil sketch of a scene that will relate to the material in a dialog on the next page. The first chapter's dialog is fairly routine with lines such as "Hi, my name is . . ." and "What's your major?" From that point, However, the student is subjected to vivid events such as television talk shows which include an interview with a dog, chance meetings at an apartment building mailbox, and two murder mysteries where one ending is given away and the other is left to the students' speculation.

The book itself should engage the students. In addition to the pencil sketches, riddles, and murder mysteries, Schmidt and Simon introduce students to a myriad of puzzles similar to those found in newspapers, and have students draw in some of their own pictures to correspond with their conversation work. The illustrations and photographs of people represent many world cultures, thereby showing no partisanship to a white-dominating US society; and although there are some extremely detailed sketches which relate to some of the exercises, the majority of the drawings are quite clear.

Frontiers succeeds in immediately guiding students through the intricacies of the English language. If the students and teachers can get past the initial shock of seeing so much work ahead of them, the text will succeed in allowing students to "learn English right" from the beginning of their studies. One should take the book step by step. If such patience is exercised, both teacher and student could have a really good time.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, A. D. (1987). The use of verbal and imagery mnemonics in second language vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9,. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daoud, A. and M. Celce-Murcia (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. In Celce-Murcia, M. and Macintosh, L. (Eds.) *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* . Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9.

ERIC S DWYER

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

TPFLE encourages submission of previously unpublished articles on pedagogical and theoretical issues relating to foreign language education, teaching of English as a foreign/second language, and applied linguistics. Reports of ongoing research are welcome.

Manuscripts should be clearly type/computer written and no more than 30 double-spaced pages in length. Authors should include a separate page with the complete title of the paper and the author's name, address, and phone number. The author's name should not appear elsewhere in the text. Manuscripts printed on the Macintosh system are strongly encouraged.

References and footnotes : In the text, references are cited using the author's last name and publication date. If quotations are cited, these should additionally have page numbers (Wilkins 1976, p. 22). The reference list should be arranged in alphabetical order following the style sheet of *The American Psychological Association*. (The *TESOL Quarterly* uses this format.)

As far as possible, comments and references should be incorporated into the text; footnotes should be set off from the text with a horizontal line.

Tables and graphs: Certain numerical tables can be typed. Other types of material (figures, illustrations, tables involving non-horizontal marks or special symbols) cannot, and must be submitted as camera ready.

The Editors of **TPFLE** reserve the right to make editorial changes in any manuscript accepted for publication.

Manuscripts submitted to **TPFLE** cannot be returned to authors.

Submissions will be accepted anytime during the academic year. Please submit two copies of your manuscript to:

Editors, **TPFLE**
Education Building 528
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin TX 78712-1295

***TPFLE* and the FLEC Journal Committee**

TPFLE, published bi-annually by the FLEC Journal Committee, is devoted to the promotion of pedagogical and theoretical issues relating to foreign language education, teaching of English as a foreign/second language, and applied linguistics.

The FLEC Journal Committee, formed in January 1988, consists of faculty and student members from FLEC. The current members of the committee are listed in the inside front cover of this issue. All students, faculty, and graduates of FLEC are eligible for membership in the committee.

The annual subscription to *TPFLE* is \$9.00, inclusive of postage. Please address all inquiries to:

TPFLE
Education Building 528
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712-1295

Make your checks payable to The University of Texas at Austin

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 1

Number 3

Fall 1989

BETTE EICHEL Computer-Assisted Cloze Exercises in the Adult ESL Classroom: Enhancing Retention

JULIA WILLIAMSON Techniques for Presenting the Short Story in the Advanced ESL Classroom

ELAINE PHILLIPS Anxiety and Speaking in the Foreign Language Classroom

DIANE BELCHER How Professors Initiate Nonnative Speakers into Their Disciplinary Discourse Communities

VICTORIA COBB Three Perspectives on Composing in a Second Language

Foreign Language Studies Center

The University of Texas at Austin

**Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education
(TPFLE)**

Editors: Elizabeth Mitchell and Nae-Dong Yang

FLSC Journal Committee

Elaine Horwitz, Faculty Advisor
Gareth Morgan, Faculty Advisor
Gary Underwood, Faculty Advisor
Joan Barnet
Patti Biley
Pam Jackson
Junil Oh
JoHanna Watzinger-Tharp
Suzanne Van Dam
Christy Yu

TPFLE is the official journal of the Foreign Language Studies Center
(FLSC) of the University of Texas at Austin.

Publication of TPFLE has been made possible by a grant from the *RGK
Foundation* of Austin, Texas.

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 1

Number 3

Fall 1989

Articles

- 168 BETTE EICHEL Computer-Assisted Cloze Exercises in the
Adult ESL Classroom: Enhancing Retention
- 182 JULIA WILLIAMSON Techniques for Presenting the Short
Story in the Advanced ESL Classroom
- 191 ELAINE PHILLIPS Anxiety and Speaking in the Foreign
Language Classroom
- 207 DIANE BELCHER How Professors Initiate Nonnative
Speakers into Their Disciplinary Discourse Communities
- 226 VICTORIA COBB Three Perspectives on Composing in a
Second Language
-

Foreign Language Studies Center

The University of Texas at Austin

Contributors

BETTE EICHEL is an instructor at Clark County Community College in N. Las Vegas, Nevada.

JULIA WILLIAMSON has two Master's degrees, in Spanish literature and English as a second language. She teaches in the Department of English at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

ELAINE PHILLIPS, a Ph.D. candidate in applied linguistics at The University of Texas at Austin, teaches French at Southwestern University.

DR. DIANE D. BELCHER is the coordinator of ESL composition courses for graduate students at Ohio State University.

VICTORIA COBB completed her Master's degree in applied linguistics at the University of Texas at Austin. She has taught ESL and is presently teaching technical communication.

Computer-Assisted Cloze Exercises in the Adult ESL Classroom: Enhancing Retention

BETTE EICHEL

Students taking laboratory -based English as a second language courses at an urban community college in Las Vegas, Nevada, have traditionally composed their assignments without the aid of an instructor, have had them graded by a teacher, and have read the responses regarding the error and style some time after the writing process had taken place. These students have experienced delayed feedback. However, the students have undergone two processes while attending class: they have both acquired and learned the second language (Krashen, 1982). Furthermore, the materials that have been used to teach these students have generally been specific to the culture of the target language. Since learners are more able to comprehend concepts that are related to their own culture, familiar material can aid in teaching second language learners to read. Readers bring to the text their own preconceived ideas, values and beliefs: In anticipating meanings of unknown words by utilizing context, forming schemata and formulating hypotheses, and testing those hypotheses (as more information is gleaned from the text), students learning a foreign language progress from the unfamiliar to the familiar and from the incomprehensible to the understandable.

Acquisition of the second language concerns developing an internal linguistic pattern which makes speaking the language natural and spontaneous. Learning (or Monitoring) is a self-correcting function which causes us to pause and improve our thoughts, sometimes before the thought has even been completed (Bialystok, 1978; Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982).

With the recent introduction of computer-assisted language programs that are easy to operate and which can be set to a particular level and style of learning, ESL students can now receive immediate, nonjudgmental (and nonembarrassing) feedback while learning English. As instruction becomes more individualized, specific lessons can be developed for each student that take into account particular learning styles and interests (Chapelle and Jamieson, 1986). Specific readings about the culture of selected second language students provide a familiar basis for instruction in the second language. While reading material that is understandable,

these students can more accurately guess the meanings of unknown words and terms by using context clues.

Even though efficient reading methods and accurate comprehension involve a balance of top-down and bottom-up reading skills and a constant interaction between these two processes (Eskey, 1988), ESL reading students may exhibit an over-reliance on one process (Carrell, 1988). Text-based information can be understood by students who possess a proficiency in the grammar and vocabulary of the second language; knowledge-based information is gleaned through the construction of schemata by using the readers' background knowledge and previous experience with the culture, beliefs, and values of the second language culture (Carrell and Eisterhold, 1988). As students approach native language fluency in the second language and demonstrate differing abilities regarding textual interaction (Grabe, 1988, 65), culture-specific reading materials are more easily comprehended.

The cloze exercise, a well-established method for assessing readability of texts (Taylor, 1953), measures the student's ability to infer meaning using contextual clues from a passage in which words and/or letters have been systematically deleted. Several computer-assisted language programs make use of the cloze design to exercise a variety of language learning skills at various levels of difficulty. Since reading is better taught from a whole language approach rather than as a set of isolated skills (Reinking, 1989), the cloze exercise can be an effective integration of literal and inferential levels of understanding.

Educators at all levels emphasize the need for more systematic evaluation of computer-assisted instruction. For example, Reinking (1988) reports in recent studies of junior high school students that reading printed and electronic text is not the same process for many students. The computer medium may foster a more meaningful interaction between the reader and the text, thereby enhancing reading comprehension. It is therefore important to us as educators to develop alternative computer-assisted programs that maximize classroom time and enhance learning. "Our understanding of L2 acquisition can be reflected in the intelligent use of computerized lessons and ultimately in the development of more 'intelligent' lessons" (Chapelle and Jamieson, 1986, 42-43).

The research question for the study reported here was the following: Does computer-assisted instruction make a difference in the acquisition of English? This question was examined by testing the following research hypothesis: There is no difference in the

scores of students using the CAI cloze exercises and the scores of those students who learn with traditional (paper-and-pencil) materials.

METHOD

The subjects were 38 community college students enrolled in several levels of English as a second language. These students came from a variety of language groups, of which Hispanics and Chinese predominated. Each student was administered a 100-item, criterion-referenced test (the ALFA Placement Indicator) specific to the course work.

A classical experimental design was used, that is pre- and post-tests and random assignment to treatment and control groups. Both groups attended classes for two hours a day, four days a week for thirteen weeks, but the experimental group used a series of software programs based on textbook readings for fifteen minutes each day (working the remaining one hour and forty-five minutes in the language laboratory). The control group received traditional instruction during the time the experimental group was absent.

Experimental group exercises consisted of a text deletion and reconstruction program of various readability levels. Students reconstructed the text by guessing words or letters that might logically belong in the position. The process of reconstruction helps students gain insight into the structure of the English language and to develop an intuitive feel for various classifications of words, such as noun, verb, adjective, or article (Chomsky and Schwartz, 1983). The program is flexible enough to allow beginning ESL students the opportunity to participate.

During the students' initial sessions with the computer, trained personnel needed to be available to demonstrate how the computer and the software programs worked; otherwise, learning was hampered by difficulties due to unfamiliarity with the technology. Reaction to using the computer was overwhelmingly positive, but with a few exceptions. Students enjoyed learning basic computer operations and quickly became skilled in typing. While conducting screening interviews with students participating in the study, we found many ESL learners regard computer literacy an important goal second only to becoming proficient in English. During the pilot study prior to the main project reported in this paper, it was sometimes difficult to keep students on task; some preferred to

manipulate the computer to discover its operating abilities and limitations, while others were determined to program the computer (frequently resulting in a jam-up of the software). However, a few students reacted negatively to utilizing the computer as a learning resource. These same students learned typing at a considerably slower rate and became bored with the video-game approach to learning. Nevertheless, all subjects worked on the CAI exercises for the time period they had initially agreed upon.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mean, variance, and standard deviation for the combined test scores of pre- and post-tests were obtained for all subjects. The mean scores and variances of the control versus the experimental group scores were used to calculate the nonparametric t test of significant difference (Siegel, 1956). Selected groups of students (grouped either by means of the Mann-Whitney U test (Siegel).

The mean scores of the control and experimental groups did not differ significantly before administration of the treatment (computer-aided cloze exercises). In addition, the Mann-Whitney U test, used to test for statistically significant values with small samples, yielded no apparent pre-test differences between Chinese and Hispanic control and experimental subjects.

In the final results, the nonparametric t test, performed on post-test scores, produced values that were near, yet not significant (at the .05 level). Finally, analysis of Chinese and Hispanic students in the control and experimental groups produced no significant differences between treatment and traditional instruction. The treatment had no significant effect on enhancing the acquisition or learning of English.

However, analysis of secondary data revealed that computer-assisted instruction did increase retention of students in the ESL program. The attrition rates for the experimental and control groups were 25% and 38% respectively (compared to an overall college attrition rate of 43%).

Several limitations of this study concern the small sample size and the instrument used to measure proficiency. In nonparametric statistics for small sample sizes, a statistically significant finding that might have been determined by the statistical methods used on larger samples is not always realized. Furthermore, there were no provisions made to test for the effect of the computer itself in

instruction. Additional research is focusing on a questionnaire or an observational instrument to measure student reaction, both positive and negative, to CAI exercises and to aid in identifying learning variables not specified in this study. In addition, a current study at Clark County Community College concerns CAI using culture-specific readings versus CAI with traditional readings from the textbook (which exemplifies the culture of the United States).

Since performance on a mastery test of English language proficiency is usually not affected by a single factor, but is a complex interaction of factors (Ellis, 1987), identification of the specific variables that enhance learning via computer-assisted instruction would enable the teacher to integrate technological innovations into the curriculum and provide a more versatile methodology for individualized instruction. The cloze exercise, an efficient indicator of proficiency and readability (Aitken, 1977), coupled with an effective CAI program designed to match the independent learning level of the student could prove to be a powerful educational and motivational aid in the teaching of ESL.

Of recent interest are studies devoted to measuring motivational change due to computer-assisted delivery systems. Seymour et al. (1987) report on a marked improvement of attitude and an enhancement of motivation attributed to using CAI versus paper-and-pencil exercises. Although studies documenting exact effects of the computer as medium are sparse, recent research has focused on the motivational aspects of CAI from a number of standpoints such as retention, feedback, degree of learner control, and individualization of learning (Seymour et al.). Researchers studying the degree of continued interest in the learning task chose difficulty of the exercises and the gender of learners as variables (Seymour et al.). They found that an overwhelming preference for the computer medium (as measured by the students' return to task) far outweighed that of the paper-and-pencil mode of exercise, even though learner performance on a proficiency test was similar in both groups.

Preference for the computer-assisted instruction was almost unanimous for male and female students. Contributing to enhanced motivation were an increased feeling of self-control over the learning medium, the ability to pace instruction, and immediate feedback, hence less frustration. Although the findings of studies to date do not support generalizations about the specific factors constituting the computer's attraction, results suggest that computer use in the

classroom does, in fact, aid in increasing student motivation and retention.

SECONDARY STUDY

The present pilot study at Clark County Community College involves 54 students from one level of English as a second language. The students are predominantly Hispanic and Asian, upper-division learners who have an intermediate proficiency level in English as measured by the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency. Most of these students plan to continue their postsecondary studies, either by remaining at the community college or by transferring to a university.

METHOD

The 54 community college students were administered the 100-item criterion-referenced test specific to the course work. Eligibility for the study was determined by test score: those students attaining between 85% and 100% and who demonstrated intermediate skills by writing a paragraph on one of several suggested topics were approached about volunteering for the study. Participants were told that they would be expected to spend extra time in the language laboratory typing stories and doing cloze exercises. Of 62 candidates, 58 agreed to take part in the study. Fifty-four of those students are currently working regularly on the project and attending class.

Students using the culture-specific materials play cloze procedure games using a varied selection of readings concerning the religion, thoughts, and ways of life identified with their country. They use a variety of programs such as *Storyboard* and *Clozemaker* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston) and *Missing Links* (Sunburst). The program features stories in which students can vary the deletion rate from every fifth word to all words, but they are not able to delete by word class. Students may play in pairs or groups, and they frequently compete for a higher score in language leagues. Accuracy and number of guesses or hints are compiled by the computer to produce a final proficiency score. One disadvantage of the software is that the computer is programmed to accept only exact word entries. Software that can manage a series of choices is

available, but instructors must enter the choices into the data file in order to adjust the course for specific needs and learning levels. Community College has not yet purchased this more flexible software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The preliminary findings indicate that students using the computer-assisted, culture-specific readings work through the material more quickly and are better able to determine the meanings of difficult words from contexts than those students working primarily with CAI of traditional readings. In addition, the experimental group has experienced a lower drop-out rate (one student) compared to the control group (three students). However, the results of the post-test and the conclusions reached from conducting statistical tests on the data will be more effective in determining if the culture-related materials did indeed make a difference in English language proficiency and retention of the adult ESL students.

COMPUTER-ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING

The computer acts as a patient drill master, as an examiner, and as a tutor. The computer exercises provide the stimulus for guessing and testing the hypotheses generated by students interacting with the reading material in the medium of a word game. In addition, groups can work well at the same game, either in competition with each other or as teams. Granted, some students prefer to work in isolation and produce the same results, but the computer can enhance group interaction and cultural exchange. Communication between group members does not have to be in the target language, although the guesses entered into the computer must be (in an exact word scored program). Students who work with cloze exercises gain insight into the word that is deleted (Jones, 1984a); learners slowly develop understanding and a realization of the meaning as schemata are constructed and tested for validity (Jones, 1984b).

The development of schemata is enhanced by including unknown words in a familiar framework; culture-specific readings. The materials used in the present study are taken from collections of

stories that represent a majority of the cultures in the classroom. Students choose the deletion frequency and decide whether or not they will receive hints from the program. After the cloze selection is completed, students obtain a final score and can record their individual progress or compete with an opposing team. Some learners utilize the computer as a quizmaster by making short-answer exercises for the class; others (modeling the Language Experience Approach) type in stories they have written and have had corrected to be used as class exercises. The atmosphere of the classroom has been one of cooperation and a willingness to expand individual cultural awareness. Students feel more comfortable interacting with material that is familiar to them.

As learners read, they reflect on the topics to increase their knowledge and assimilate different beliefs and behaviors into the schemata they have already formed. Readers tend to distort text to fit their knowledge (LeSourd, 1988). Sensitizing students to the material can enhance comprehension: by teaching learners to skim and predict, providing an overview and a structure for discussion of the topic before the reading, formulating preview questions, and establishing an advance organizer, teachers can help learners to comprehend more of what they read, especially if the material is related to the student's own culture. The new concepts they encounter in the text are woven together with old knowledge in a hierarchical arrangement of ideas, providing students have some background information on which to build. The teacher can guide students to deeper comprehension by providing a framework of beliefs and values about the culture to be studied, so that the readings will "make sense."

Pugh (1989) maintains that intercultural readings in English which contain universal themes are more understandable than stories specific only to the second language culture. Reading does not have to be a laborious and frustrating exercise in translation and grammar but can be a rich and enjoyable language and cultural experience. By using materials that concern significant human problems which are universal to the majority of cultures (such as "literature"), we can spark interest and motivation to learn. Literature provides such a rich, comprehensible input and causes the reader to draw upon previous knowledge and preconceived ideas (schemata) of the experiences described. the readings used in the study reflected universal themes that could be understood by a majority of ESL students.

Student interest was enhanced by utilizing material that contained information slightly surprising but which could be incorporated into the reader's existing knowledge base or schemata (Hidi and Baird, 1988). Concepts deemed incomprehensible were not included in the readings. For example, the theme of children growing up and becoming independent is universal, but it is expressed differently in various societies. Certain cultures would not understand and may even become offended by portrayal of the American teenager's rebellion against authority figures. Therefore, we chose to omit readings that we considered to be too culturally sensitive.

Hidi and Baird (1988) suggest that recall of ideas be enhanced by including selections that concern the knowledge base and the values of the reader. We found interesting materials regarding universal concepts in three ESL readers, *Stories from Latin America*; *Noah and the Golden Turtle*; and *Cross-Cultural Readings for Writers*. Intermediate reading level texts for the control group were taken from *Americana* and *Contact: USA*. Selections from these texts were used to construct the computer-assisted cloze exercises.

SOFTWARE AND SUGGESTIONS FOR USAGE

The computer programs utilized in the first and second studies were *Clozemaker*, *Storyboard*, and *Missing Links*. All of these programs have the advantage that students can preview the material for a certain length of time, anywhere from five seconds to indefinitely. The help feature allows students to obtain hints from the program in the form of one letter or whole word clues. Students familiar with the selection can choose to delete the entire text and reconstruct the reading through a series of guesses. They make a strategy for supplying the missing words; word class and frequency in the English language are taken into account in the guessing procedure, which requires a pooling of knowledge in the use of prediction skills, cohesion features of the language and specialized vocabulary (Jones and Fortescue, 1987). *Storyboard* has been used around the world to translate stories into different languages (Jones and Fortescue). A revised edition, *Storyboard Plus*, includes cassettes and pictures; students are asked to recreate the text using the tapes and diagrams.

Recent innovations in cloze design include *Customized Context-Clue Reader* (Merit Audio Visual), a series of programs available for reading levels 2-8. In addition, *Customized Subject Area Reading* is

an individually paced course that helps students read more effectively. The Teacher's Key allows editing and printing of material, including student records. *Cloze-Plus* (Milliken Courseware) is a series of modified cloze exercises in a multiple-choice format for grades 3 and up. The graphic rewards may enhance student motivation.

Word processing skills require an integrated skill approach just as the cloze procedure exercises do. *Magic Slate* by Sunburst allows students to type in their own stories and to do "guided writing" activities such as text correction or improvement exercises (for advanced level students). In addition, an extensive text correction program, *WordMAP*, now in place at Community College, offers grammatical and stylistic suggestions via computer analysis. Similar to *UNIX Writer's Workbench* by Bell Laboratories, *WordMAP* flags possible grammatical errors for the student to examine. Specific exercises using word-processing and grammar correction programs (*Right Writer II*) can be designed for individual classes. For example, students can be asked to rewrite wordy text, change singular forms to plural, masculine to feminine, reorganize the sequence of events, introduce transitional phrases into a piece of writing, etc. The advantages of using *Magic Slate*, or a similar word processing program, and *WordMAP* are that the student has mobility and can experiment with the text, a clean copy is produced, and the corrections students make can be temporary: the student stores his work and loads it into the computer whenever he is ready to continue creating. Special additional features are a spelling checker and a thesaurus.

OTHER USES OF COMPUTERS IN THE CLASSROOM

What are other uses of the computer in addition to drill-and-practice exercises and word games? Students and faculty demonstrate resourcefulness in designing learning activities using computers. For example, students can type stories and distribute them to the class for discussion of multicultural topics. Student-designed quizzes and comprehension questions aid in understanding the text. Students can also play quiz show, testing each other for comprehension and global cultural awareness. At the end of one semester, a booklet of stories can be compiled by the class for future courses and for the learning resources center. Guided readings and comprehension questions, writing topics, and discussion themes are

generated through student interaction with culture-specific materials. In other words, students take a more active interest in learning, and several studies have indicated that adults who are able to perform hands-on activities feel more in control of their learning processes and experience increased motivation (Knowles, 1980; Turner, 1988).

Clozemaker and *Storyboard* feature an authoring system which offers teachers the option of tailoring materials to student needs and interests that fit the curriculum. The writer program allows instructors to write and edit data and files, enter new data files (stories, vocabulary), delete superfluous information, and copy sections of the text over to another file. The printer option allows teachers and students to prepare quizzes and exercises from the texts. *Storyboard* accepts whole text entry, and it enables the user to move and correct text or to rewrite portions of the text. In addition, the authoring system can be learned in ten minutes, and the documentation is easy to understand. However, the program is based on exact word entry; there is no feature that includes a variety of acceptable answers.

Other programs of interest to the ESL instructor include commercial simulations that can be stopped and restarted at a later time without having to start and lose data. Generally, such programs require critical thinking and advanced planning to create solutions to the posed problems. Instructors may schedule the programs to complement modules of the curriculum. Additional problem-solving activities for groups feature games similar to those found in a video arcade. Interactive software will address the student by name and react to manipulation by displaying human-like responses.

Jones and Fortescue, in reviewing *London Adventure*, a game that responds to grammatical errors as a native speaker would, points out that the software contains a language teaching element, which the following example demonstrates.

The scene is k  sok. A foreign student, wishing to buy a postcard, approaches the clerk.

Tourist: * "I like this postcard."

Clerk: "Yes, it is nice, isn't it?"

Inappropriate comments can cause misunderstanding but are not rejected by the program.

Software and cassettes enhance skills in dictation, following directions, filling in information in blanks, and study habits (note-taking, listening, forming questions). Databases can be created

from student book reviews and summaries. Critical thinking skills are enhanced as students devise techniques for searching through these databases to retrieve information. Other uses include writing weather reports and travel guides for specific countries, thereby introducing a multicultural element into the course. Some classes have even decided to operate dating services!

Computer-assisted language learning presents endless possibilities for the creative instructor and student to enhance the curriculum. An improved curriculum that relates directly to the learner and generates enthusiasm for learning English increases student retention and makes better use of technology.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, P., & Mackey, D. (1982). *Contact: USA*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Aitken, K. (1977). using cloze procedure as an overall language proficiency test. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11, 59-67.
- ALFA Achievement Tests. (1983). Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1963). *The psychology of meaningful verbal learning*. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. *language Learning*, 28, 69-83.
- Carrell, P. (1988). Some causes of text-boundedness and schema interference in ESL reading pedagogy. In P. Carrell, J Devine, & D. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp.73-92). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapelle, C., & Jamieson, J. (1986). Computer-assisted language learning as a predictor of success in acquiring English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 27-45.
- Chomsky, C., & Schwartz, H. (1983). *Manual for Missing Links educational computer program*. Pleasantville, NY: Sunburst.
- Diekhoff, G., & Diekhoff, K. (1984). The adult literacy program attrition problem: identification at intake. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*, 8, 34-47.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dunn, S. S. (1985). *Noah and the golden turtle: Stories from the East and West for the ESL student*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eskey, D. (1988). Holding in the bottom: an interactive approach to the language problems of second language readers. In P. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 93-100). New York: Cambridge University press.
- Hidi, S., & Baird, W. (1988). Strategies for increasing text-based interest and students, recall of expository texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(4), 465-483.
- Higgins, J., & Johns, T. (1984). *Computers in language learning*. London: Collins.
- Hope, G. R., Taylor, H. F., & Puscack, J. P. (1984). *Using computers in teaching foreign languages*. West Nyack, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Jones, C. (1984a). *Manual for CLOZEMASTER educational program*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Jones, C., & Fortescue, S. (1987). *Using computers in the language classroom*. New York: Longman.
- Knowles, M. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: pedagogy to andragogy*. Chicago, IL: Follett Publishing Company.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- LeSourd, S. J. (1988). Using an advance organizer to set the schema for a multicultural lesson. *Journal of Reading*, 32(1), 12-18.
- McPartland, P. (1983). *Americana*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich.
- Myers, L. T. (1987). *Stories from Latin America: An ESL/ESL reader*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pugh, S. L. (1989). Literature, culture and ESL: a natural convergence. *Journal of Reading*, 32(4), 320-329.
- Reinking, D. (1988). Computer-mediated text and comprehension differences: The role of reading time, reader preference, and estimation of learning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(4), 484-498.
- Reinking, D. (1989). Misconceptions about reading and software development. *The computing Teacher*, 16(4), 27-29.
- Seymour, S., Sullivan, H., Story, N., & Mosley, M. L. (1987). Microcomputers and continuing motivation. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 35(1), 18-23.

- Siegel, S. (1956). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Taylor, W. (1953). Cloze procedure: A tool for measuring readability. *Journalism Quarterly*, 30, 414-438.
- Turner, T. (1988). *Ourselves among others: Cross-cultural readings for writers*. New York: St.Martin's Press.
- Wyatt, D. H. (1984). *Computers and ESL*. West Nyack, NY: Prentice-Hall.

Techniques For presenting Short Story in the Advanced ESL Classroom

JULIA WILLIAMSON

Along with the renewed interest in literature as an instructional medium and the large number of convincing arguments for the use of literature in the ESL classroom (Oster, 89) has come the question of which literature to teach and what approach(es) to use. The linguistic and cultural sophistication of the students, as well as the purpose for the study, must determine the answers to this question. What follows are suggested means for teachers of literature—especially teachers in the college classroom—to introduce their students to the wealth of American short stories.

The first question is which of these stories to use and then, in what order to present them. The text which I use, Ann Charters' The Story and Its Writer, Arranges chronologically 107 American and international short stories, in this way placing the authors in historical perspective and offering a look at the development of the short story over time. Another approach is to group the stories according to the elements of fiction which are most salient in them. For example, the setting of Kate Chopin's "Story of an Hour" is of little consequence; it is the themes, the message of the importance of self-assertion which the author wants to bring to the reader's attention. Setting is, on the other hand, a very important aspect of Edith Wharton's "Roman Fever" since it is the presence of the two older women before the grandeur of the Roman Forum that brings about their reminiscences and, ultimately, their climactic confessions. These two stories would, then, appear in different categories and would illustrate in their specific ways the elements of fiction. A third approach for presenting the stories is to place them by theme. In such a design, stories concerning the opposition of women might appear together, e.g., Charlotte Perkins Gilman's "Yellow Wallpaper," Kate Chopin's "Story of an Hour," and Mary E. Wilkins Freeman's "The Revolt of 'Mother'" Another group might include the theme of fantasy vs. reality: Ambrose Bierce's "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge," and James Thurber's "The Secret Life of Walter Mitty." One less teacher-centered way of making short story selections is to include the students in the selection process (Leki, 1986, pp.3-4). Students can brainstorm the

names of authors they are familiar with (in the case of my classes, only American authors). Then the teacher could supply some biographical data about each author, furnish additional explanations about his or her works, and offer suggestions as to the appropriateness of that selection. This approach to the selection process would probably work best in an English class where there is no strict adherence to a required body of work.

The selection and arrangement of stories completed, a discussion of the six elements of fiction, plot, setting, character, point of view, style and theme, is then in order. Such discussion adds a vital dimension to the students' understanding of the structure of the short story. Armed with the knowledge that every story is more than just a plot line, students learn to search for meaning in a holistic fashion, examining all the elements of fiction as they apply to each work.

Before the students read a story—or at least before any class discussion begins—I present a brief overview of the author as a pre-reading activity. The key here is not to bore with detail but rather to spark interest by explaining the era in which the author lived and any interesting (read: scandalous) events attached to his/her life. Poe's marriage to his thirteen year old cousin, his bouts with alcoholism, and his severed relations with his adoptive father make good attention-getters. Likewise, the fact that Stephen Crane never bothered to marry "Mrs." Crane evokes smiles, as does Flannery O'Connor's penchant for raising peacocks.

Another important pre-reading detail is the list of questions and vocabulary which accompanies each story. The questions are designed to offer insight into the story, to address content rather than artistry. The Story and Its Writer has a separate instructor's manual with such questions for each story. The questions address characters' actions and mention specific, recurring words and phrases. They guide the students by pointing out details; in a way these questions provide the answers themselves. In Faulkner's "Dry September," for example, the town is oppressed by stifling heat, and the townspeople's nerves are on end, their tempers ready to flare. This fact is brought to the students' attention through this question: "What is the effect of all uncompleted statements?" and through further questions which lead the students back to the text for a closer look at the dialogue and the deeper significance of the characters' (particularly McLendon's) words. The vocabulary I present along with these questions is not in list form. I choose only those few pivotal words whose meanings are essential to the

understanding of the plot. Instead of taking the words out of context, I type the entire sentence, or more, and underline the chosen word. Then I type an explanation of that word as it relates to the meaning of that sentence and to the substance of the plot or theme. Thus students are not burdened with an overwhelming list of unrelated words to be defined and promptly forgotten at story's end.

Pre-reading aside, the next step is presentation of the short story itself. The key to enhancing student interest is variety of presentation and enthusiasm. But just as important is clarity of purpose. Ultimately the goal is to provide the students with freer access to the short story, that is to make comprehension of the short story easier for them, and more enjoyable. Over time, I have experimented with a large number of short stories and approaches to introducing them. The more successful techniques and strategies I have employed on certain stories are described below.

To ease the students into the concept of stories as literature, and to facilitate interpretation, I often choose to read in class a fable, such as Paul Bowles "The Hyena," as a ice-breaker. The themes of fables are usually obvious; besides, most students can relate to this abbreviated form, having been exposed to it in their own countries. A swapping of tales follows the reading and discussion of the fable, which helps students begin to feel at ease with their fellow classmates and with the prospect of analyzing short stories. The fable lends itself quite well to the teaching of literature. More ideas for employing it in the ESL classroom can be found in Marie Ponsot's book *Beat Not the Poor Desk*.

Reading to students, particularly to internationals, is a strategy I recommend employing from time to time. My students, after following along in their texts as I read, tell me that their comprehension has increased, and that my explanatory asides and native-speaker dramatic interpretation are of great help to them. Many short stories lend themselves to dramatic reading, but I find that with any story of more than ten pages it is difficult to maintain students' attention. Stories employing regional dialect and a lot of dialog are good candidates for oral presentation. Many of my students claim to get lost in the lines of dialog when those passages do not contain text-establishing clues like "he said" or "she replied." In addition, dialog is difficult for them to follow because so much of the true communication is not stated but implied, and reading between the lines is no easy matter for non-native readers. Among the most popular of the stories I have read aloud to my students is

Eudora Welty's "A Worn Path." The storyline is painfully straightforward and simply narrates the trek to town of a poor old Southern black woman who must get medicine for her disabled grandson. Yet when read aloud with the proper hint of pathos and a properly applied Southern accent, the story holds the students' interest and arouses their sympathies for the old woman.

Another means of introducing a short story is by way of a film or video. There are large numbers of short stories available on video now. The American Short Story Collection is available for rental in the larger video stores across the nation. The most complete guide to what is out in video form is the Video Source Book, 10th edition, 1989. Available in the reference section of most libraries, it is a guide to more than 54,000 video programs. Each alphabetical entry provides a surplus of information—from a description of the program to its rating, audience, purpose, distributor, availability for rental and/or purchase, etc. More information about this guide can be obtained from: Gale Research Inc., Book Tower, Dept. 77748, Detroit, MI 48277-0748. Other sources of nonprint materials include: Educator's Guide (to film, filmstrips, and tapes), Media Review Digest, The Film File, and International Index to Recorded Poetry.

The great advantage of using videos is that they provide visual and auditory aids to a multi-cultural group who bring a diverse set of preconceptions and perspectives to each short story. When reading American short stories, the native speaker's frame of reference and the author's are naturally in tune. But the mental pictures and cultural associations of international students often interfere with understanding the author's original intention. When reading Poe's "The Tell-Tale Heart," my students often assume that the narrator is a deranged male employee. When reading Jewett's "The White Heron," some students fail to appreciate the significance of the description of the little girl's surroundings, perhaps because these students have little knowledge of bucolic settings, and certainly no familiarity with Maine's landscape. Viewing a video of this story (Learning Corporation of America, 1987) allows students to see that the director has interpreted the short story very differently. By viewing story videos students learn to question their own analysis of a work and pay closer attention to details in the interpretation of the story. Not only do they learn that in literature there is a certain amount of flexibility, they also have the opportunity to literally see what they could not envision due to their cultural and geographic differences.

Among the videos that I find very useful are Ambrose Bierce's "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge" (Hollywood Home Theater, 1987). This short feature is a delight to ESL students since there is practically no dialog, just a nature's-eye view of a man escaping from death. Having read a detailed description of Farquhar's "escape," students seeing the video have the opportunity to marvel at the author's great talent for description. The students also get the chance to anxiously follow Farquhar's trail to freedom and to see how important it is for an author to establish an empathetic link between the reader and the characters. The video of Kate Chopin's "Story of an Hour" (ISHTAR, 1982) is another fine example. Although the story itself is only three pages long, the video allows students to enter the mind of Mrs. Mallard and to follow her through flashbacks into her past and to live her fantasies of freedom. Through these flashes of insight, the students come to know her character better. Other videos I often employ include Faulkner's "Barn Burning" (American Short Story Series, 1980), O'Connor's "Good Country People" (Jeff Jackson, 1975), Cather's "Paul's Case" (American Short Story Series, 1980), and Hemingway's "Soldier's Home" (American Short Story Series, 1985). If literature "mirrors national culture and can therefore acquaint students with the aesthetic, moral, and spiritual values of [a] nation and the rules of [a] social system" (Spack, 1985, 705), then seeing that literature brought to life on film is an even more powerful mechanism for acculturizing students.

Because learning to analyze and interpret literature is an important objective in my classroom, I also use film independently of literature to show students that once their analytical skills are honed they will be able to employ them across other media. To prepare the students for a full-length film, a brief review of the elements of fiction may be useful. Plot, character, setting, and theme all translate well from one medium to another. Point of view and style may require further explanation. I point out different camera shots, such as the subjective view in which we, the audience see everything as if we were one of the characters. The examination of style calls for more subtlety, and the subject of style is one which I approach only topically even in our short stories. Students can best be informed of style throughout the work of an auteur, so Hitchcock's films are my preference. Helpful guides for interpreting this masterpiece are Hitchcock's Films by Robin Wood, and Filmguide to Psycho by Naremore. Before we view the film, I describe Hitchcock's style of directing, symbols the students should

look for, and recurring leitmotifs. After watching the first hour of the film, we discuss the elements of fiction as found in the film and predict what will transpire in the last half of the film. When the movie ends, the same procedure is repeated. Later in the semester, I ask the students, by way of review, to give me a brief overview of a film they have attended since our discussion on film, and they seem pleased that they can approach films with new powers of discrimination.

In teaching international students, teachers should also be apprised of the existence of close-captioned films, sometimes available through schools for the deaf. In addition, cable channels also offer a close-captioned service which might prove useful in an ESL literature course. The benefits of these subtitled, or close-captioned, films is that there is less chance of students' misunderstanding what is being said since the dialog is printed on the screen.

When film or video is not available, there are often books/short stories on tape to facilitate reading comprehension. Many of Ray Bradbury's short stories, for instance are available on tape. One which is particularly appropriate for ESL students, who are also in an "alien" land, is "Dark They Were and Golden Eyed," a story which involves the trials, tribulations, and eventual assimilation of an Earth family on the planet Mars. The story is narrated by Orson Welles and is only about 30 minutes in length. Poe's tales are also available on tape and are a definite aid in ESL reader's comprehension since Poe's style is unique and his vocabulary is sometimes archaic. Different versions of Poe's work exist, but one of the finest versions is narrated by Basil Rathbone and produced by Cadmon, the largest maker of spoken-word cassettes.

Thurber's "The Secret Life of Walter Mitty" is also a favorite with students. A full length feature film, which only vaguely resembles the short story, was made in 1947. It derived from a radio play of the same name which is available on tape and is only about 30 minutes long. It, too, takes all sorts of liberties with the original story and requires special pre-listening preparation, yet it has entertainment value and some merit in that it allows students to see how Hollywood has revised an original work of fiction. This is a lesson to them in creative license and helps them see that original truths in literature are sometimes bent to fit a film image. The Walter Mitty cassette is volume 6 of series called Radiobook Cassettes and can be ordered through Radio/Video Yesteryear, Box C, Sandy Hook, CT 06482, or may possibly be gotten through publishers

Central Bureau. Also, just released is a collection called Selected Shorts: A Celebration of the Short Story. It includes William Hurt reading Richard Ford's "Communist," Anne Pitoniak reading Grace Paley's "A Conversation with My Father," and Jerry Stiller reading John Sayle's "At the Anarchist's Convention." This two-cassette set can be ordered for about \$19.95 from Symphony Space, 2537 Broadway at 95th Street, New York, NY 10025.

Music can also be used creatively in teaching short stories. For instance, before we read Faulkner's "A Rose for Emily," I play for my students two songs by Helen Reddy, "Delta Dawn" and "Angie Baby"; and one by the Beatles, "Eleanor Rigby." They are given a copy of the lyrics before we hear the songs and I hint to them to expect the themes of the songs to appear in their reading of Faulkner's story. The first of these songs, "Delta Dawn," tells the story of a peculiar forty-year-old spinster who, while awaiting the return of her lover long gone, remains under the dictatorial care of her father. The undertones of "Angie Baby" are of murder and necrophilia, and "Eleanor Rigby" is a song about an old maid still waiting for her prince Charming, or for a friend of any kind. Together these songs present a composite study of Faulkner's character, Miss Emily.

Role-playing is an often-suggested technique for teaching a story. With native speakers it may be more easily employed since most students can read aloud smoothly and are willing to use some amount of theatrics. International students are not so skilled and are hesitant to display their weaknesses to fellow classmates. My solution is to choose some of the more proficient readers, give them a script, and practice with them before class. I often use Wharton's "Roman Fever" for this. Although there is much dialog in the story, there is also a narrator, so I type up the story in play form, keeping the dialog, creating additional dialog in the original narration, and adding occasional stage directions. I choose two female students, present them with props such as old-fashioned hats, knitting needles, gloves, glasses, handbags, and then I work with them a couple of days before the script is to be read in class. The students seem to enjoy the play and are afterwards very ready for the discussion of the unfolding of the two characters' personalities in the dialog. A twist on this technique would be to have students prepare their own dialog of the scenes that do not appear in the story, i.e., the scenes that occur "offstage" but have obviously influenced the action (Gajdusek, 1988, 252).

Yet another way to involve the students in the reading of short stories is to have them respond to the stories privately, each student keeping a literary journal. Sometimes class discussion doesn't adequately explain a story, whereas writing about what has been read often helps clarify the text. Through this discovery process, students often stumble onto important insights. For example, one of my students, while reporting the plot line of O'Connor's "A Good Man is Hard to Find," discovered that numerology was a very important part of the story. The number of family members making the trip, he noted, matched the number of graves in the cemetery they passed. The number of times the grandmother was shot also matched the number of mistakes she had made which had led to her family's murder. This approach is a part of response heuristics. Spak quotes Bleich as recommending that students be "asked to write, first, what they perceive in the text, and then how they feel about what they see [there], and finally what associations—thoughts and feelings—inform and follow their perceptions" (1985, 716). Journal entries need not be kept on each short story, but instead such journals might be viewed as prewriting activities to be employed only at the students' discretion.

Further activities and ideas about presenting literature—including novels and poems—can be found in Literature in the Language Classroom. Although this book was designed with adult, pre-university ESL students in mind, its many and varied activities could easily be adapted to other student groups.

Diversity of presentation is the most important aspect of instructional procedure. It fosters students' reading comprehension by equipping them with the tools for developing a deeper, more fulfilling understanding of literature. Literature exists in relationship to the greater world of common human experiences. Therefore, it is our charge as language teachers to help our students see how literature reflects that world, to help them to make sense of it, and to do so in a manner that challenges yet entertains.

REFERENCES

- Charters, A. (1987). *The story and its writer*. Second edition. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Collier, J., & Slater, S. (1987). *Literature in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gajdusek, L. (1988). Toward wider use of literature in ESL: Why and how. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 227-257.
- Leki, I. (1986). Teaching literature of the United States to nonnative speakers. *English Teaching Forum*, Jan., 2-8.
- Miller, J. (1989). Using literature in group discussion. *Practical English Teaching*, 9 (4), 23-24.
- Oster, J. (1989). Seeing with different eyes: Another view of literature in the ESL class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 85-103.
- Roberts, E. (1982). *Writing themes about literature*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Spack, R. (1985). Literature, reading, writing, and ESL: Bridging the gaps. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 703-725.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1975). *Stylistics and the teaching of literature*. London: Longman.

Anxiety and Speaking in the Foreign Language Classroom

ELAINE M. PHILLIPS

The role of affective variables in foreign and second language learning has, for some time, been deemed as worthy of study as have cognitive variables in language acquisition research (see Brown, 1980, for example). Indeed, Bailey (1983) believes that

for many people involved in language teaching and learning, the hypothesis that the affective domain is significant in second language learning is intuitively sound. It is a widely held belief that *what the learner experiences in a language lesson* [emphasis added] is as important as the teaching method, the sequence of presentation, or the instructional materials. (p.71)

Several affective variables such as attitude and motivation (Gardner and Lambert, 1972), self-esteem (Heyde, 1979), inhibition and empathy (Guiora, 1972), introversion and extroversion (Naiman, Frölich, and Stern, 1975), aggression (Laforge, 1971), and anxiety (Gardner, Smythe, and Brunet, 1976; Gardner, et al., 1977; Tucker, Hamayan, and Genesee, 1976; Steinberg, 1982; Young, 1985; Scott, 1986) have been identified and researched.

Though the significance of these affective variables has yet to be definitively established, the importance of foreign language classroom anxiety has been underscored in the last two decades by the large role it has played in the development of new language teaching approaches. Asher (1977), for example, found the language classroom environment so stressful that he developed a teaching technique known as Total Physical Response (TPR) which allows the student a lengthy "silent period" where the majority of responses in the early stages of learning are physical rather than oral. Likewise, Terrell (1982) devised the Natural Approach, in part an attempt to reduce anxiety, which begins by permitting the learner to respond in the native language or with a shake or nod of the head or with simple one or two word responses. Other perhaps less commonly utilized methods such as the Silent Way (Gattegno, 1976), Community Language Learning (Curran, 1976) and Suggestopedia (Lozanov, 1978) also actively attempt to speed

language acquisition by creating a low stress environment in the classroom.

Paralleling the developing interest in reducing the anxiety levels of language students has been a growing concern with oral proficiency. New teaching methodologies and the oral proficiency/communicative competence movement have resulted in changes in the instructional focus of many language classrooms. Rather than centering language instruction primarily on memorization, pattern drills, and grammatical explanations, more and more, teachers are stressing functional language use and are providing additional opportunity for practice in communicative activities. This shift in emphasis poses a paradox, however, for while it is the oral skill that most interests language students (Lindenau, 1987), speaking in the foreign language also causes students the most anxiety (Price, forthcoming).

The interest in anxiety as it relates to language learning and the oral skill is intuitively sound to most language teachers who can readily identify anxious learners who have been in their classes. These are the students who sit in the back of the room, attempt to hide in their seats, never volunteer, and when called upon, respond in a barely audible whisper. They may be frequently absent from class, often neglecting to turn in homework. The importance of anxiety in language learning is not only intuitively sound; it is also supported by the research. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986), for instance, found the problem of anxiety in the language classroom so widespread that over a third of the students they surveyed were concerned enough about their language classes to volunteer to attend special sessions aimed at reducing anxiety through group support. In addition, they found that students were especially concerned about the oral component of the class as evidenced by considerable agreement with such statements as "I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class," "I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class," and "Even if I am well prepared for the class, I feel anxious about it."

Several other studies verify the findings of Horwitz et al. For example, Price's report (forthcoming) of interviews with fifteen highly anxious ex-foreign language students indicates that *all* of the learners felt that speaking in the language in class had been the greatest cause of anxiety. They feared "being laughed at," "making fools of themselves," and "being ridiculed." One student who never managed to say a word in class but practiced religiously in her room confessed regretfully, "You knew that you were never, never going

to be able to say it like he [the teacher] did . . . you were going to fail at pronouncing those words." In another study of foreign language classroom anxiety (Young, forthcoming), a survey found that some activities were more stressful than others, especially speaking in front of the class and impromptu role-playing. Bailey's diary studies (1983), on the other hand, let the students' own words reveal the intensity of their emotions:

I floundered through the class, making at least four stupid mistakes out loud. I felt so lost! . . . Today my palms were sweating and I was chewing my lip through the entire class. (p. 75)

I notice that I still continue to stutter quite a bit—a problem I don't seem to have in English. It's usually (perhaps always) when I'm called upon for a one-sentence response. I tend to get very nervous and it takes me a few seconds before I can even start to speak, even when it's a relatively simple task or phrase. I'm obviously very afraid to make a mistake in front of the class. (Lynch, in Bailey, p. 82)

Finally, the beliefs about language learning that students bring with them to class may also contribute to their anxiety about language learning. Horwitz (1988), for instance, found 40-68% of the subjects felt that speaking with an excellent accent, no simple task, was very important. Price's subjects, likewise, recalled the embarrassment of mispronouncing "at our age" and the shame of "their Texas accents."

Although these studies appear to establish the oral skill as predominant in provoking foreign language classroom anxiety, other questions remain to be examined. What, for instance, is the relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and the sex of the language learner? Does past experience with foreign/second language learning influence the learner's expression of anxiety? Is anxiety related to the language studied? Do students who express confidence in their ability to succeed at language learning feel less anxious in the classroom? To search for answers to these questions, the present study looks, in part, at four factors (sex, language learning experience, language studied, and confidence) because of the ease with which these elements might be used to identify anxious learners and because teachers may believe instinctively that they are related to classroom anxiety. The second part of the study is devoted to an analysis of the subjects' responses to a questionnaire bearing on their affective reactions to speaking the foreign language.

PROCEDURE

Information related to subjects' attitudes and feelings about speaking in the foreign language class was gathered from a self-report questionnaire administered during the third week of the semester. Additional information collected concerned the subjects' language background, sex, and expectations for success in the language class.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were first semester language students at a small, private, church-affiliated university in the Southwest. The questionnaire was administered during the third week of class to 101 subjects in four intact language classes: two French classes (N=41), one Spanish class (N=35), and one German class (N=25). The researcher was the instructor for one of the French classes, approximately half of the French subjects, and the other classes were taught by different professors. There were 56 females and 45 males in the study. The large majority of subjects were taking language classes to fulfill general education requirements. Though participation in the study was entirely voluntary, no students refused to participate.

Instrument

A questionnaire, the Measure of Speaking Apprehension (MSA), was devised by the experimenter, based upon the Daly-Miller Test (DMT), a measure of writing apprehension (Daly and Miller, 1975) and was adapted to measure subjects' anxiety as it relates to speaking in a foreign language classroom. The original instrument, the DMT, obtained a reliability coefficient of .94 using a split-halves technique and a test-retest reliability over a week of .92. A predictive validity study found that subjects high in writing apprehension had occupations with writing requirements that differed significantly from the moderate and low anxiety groups; that is, the measure effectively predicted Ss who avoided occupations requiring considerable writing.

The revised instrument used in the current study (MSA) contains 30 statements to which subjects respond on a scale from 1 to 5 (strongly agree to strongly disagree). Scores could thus range from

30 to 150 with a higher score indicating a higher level of anxiety. Twenty-three statements were retained from the DMT, preserving as closely as possible the substance and form of those on the original measure, changing the skill (from written to oral) and adapting the context to the foreign language classroom. Seven statements were added to the questionnaire, primarily to address specific activities common in language classes. An internal reliability analysis was conducted on the MSA (Kronbach's Alpha Coefficient) revealing a reliability of 0.95 ($N=101$). The test-retest reliability studies are in progress. In sum, both the measure on which the MSA was based and the MSA itself appear to be reliable. In addition, an analysis of the revised statements reveal high content validity; they appear to successfully represent the construct. No other validity studies have been conducted to date.

DATA ANALYSIS OF PREDICTOR VARIABLES

Several statistical procedures were used to analyze the data related to four predictor variables: language background, language studied, sex of learner, and learner confidence in ability to succeed in language class. First, several correlations were computed to examine the relationship between anxiety and the predictor variables. The subject's total score on the MSA was correlated with years of previous language study ($r = -.19$, $p = <.03$), a question predicting success in language class ($r = .47$, $p = <.000$), and sex (NS).

Next, the mean anxiety scores on the MSA for the entire population (total) and for the individual language groups (French, German, Spanish) were computed. The total mean on the instrument was 82.4 ($SD = 20.8$). A one-way ANOVA revealed no two language groups were significantly different at the .05 level; i.e., based on language group mean scores, subjects in one language were no more or less anxious than those in another.

Finally, subjects were placed in high (HA), moderate (MA), and low anxiety (LA) groups based on their total score on the MSA. One SD above and below the population mean was used as the cut off point in group assignment. subjects scoring 61 to 103 were assigned to the MA group, those scoring below 61, to the LA group, and those scoring above 103 to the high anxiety group. A chi-square statistic was used to examine the relationship of the anxiety groups with the language groups. No significant differences were found using this procedure, nor did a Pearson's correlation

find a significant relationship between anxiety group and language group. In addition, anxiety group classification was correlated with years of previous language study ($r = -.29$, $p = <.002$), prediction of success ($r = .26$, $p = <.005$), language group (NS), and sex (NS).

RESULTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

In addition to a general survey of speaking apprehension, the questionnaire was designed to obtain information about subjects' affective reactions to various classroom activities and to oral evaluation. This information was considered valuable because, with the current interest in developing oral competence, more and more students may encounter communicative exercises and oral assessment. The statements from the survey have been grouped into three categories: classroom activities, evaluation, and non-specific expressions of anxiety. Responses to the statements are presented below, and a discussion of the responses may be found in the subsequent section.

Classroom Activities

The following statements are associated with specific oral activities in the language classroom:

#15. Standing in front of the class to speak makes me very uncomfortable.

	FRE	SPN	GER	Total(%)
agree	32	66	60	51
uncertain	10	14	8	11
disagree	59	20	32	39

#17 I feel confident doing oral class exercises.

agree	59	49	52	54
uncertain	12	20	4	13
disagree	29	31	44	34

#18 I have fun when we role-play situations in class.

agree	61	37	72	46
uncertain	12	37	24	28
disagree	27	26	4	27

#20 I feel uncomfortable doing oral work in small groups.

agree	15	3	12	20
uncertain	10	43	48	31
disagree	76	54	40	59

#33 I enjoy doing oral work with a partner.

agree	66	52	52	58
uncertain	12	37	32	26
disagree	22	11	16	17

Evaluation

The following statements deal with the subjects' feelings toward evaluation of their oral performance including teacher evaluation, peer evaluation, and self evaluation.

#9 I have no fear of having my speaking evaluated.

agree	41	57	32	48
uncertain	2	11	8	7
disagree	49	32	60	46

#11 I am afraid to speak when I know my speech will be evaluated.

agree	39	34	36	37
uncertain	10	9	8	9
disagree	53	57	56	55

#24 I expect to do poorly on oral tests even before I take them.

agree	5	14	16	11
uncertain	15	14	28	18
disagree	80	71	56	71

#25 I like hearing myself speak in the foreign language.

agree	71	51	60	61
uncertain	10	29	20	19
disagree	20	20	20	20

198/Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

#26 Discussing my speaking ability with others is an enjoyable experience.

agree	24	26	32	27
uncertain	46	54	48	50
disagree	29	20	20	24

#28 When I have to perform orally, I know I am going to do poorly.

agree	5	14	12	20
uncertain	5	14	8	9
disagree	90	72	80	81

#30 I don't think I speak as well as most other people in the class.

agree	46	34	24	37
uncertain	20	27	16	22
disagree	34	37	60	42

#31 I don't like to have my speaking evaluated.

agree	29	37	36	34
uncertain	12	11	4	10
disagree	59	51	60	57

#32 I am not good at speaking the foreign language.

agree	24	29	32	28
uncertain	27	26	8	22
disagree	49	46	60	51

#35 I like to have my friends hear me speak the foreign language.

agree	47	31	48	42
uncertain	32	34	20	30
disagree	22	34	32	29

Non-Specific Expressions of Anxiety

The remaining statements are related to non-specific feelings of anxiety about speaking the foreign language.

#8 I avoid speaking in class.

agree	15	17	40	22
uncertain	5	9	0	5
disagree	80	74	60	73

#10 I look forward to expressing myself out loud.

agree	56	43	36	47
uncertain	17	23	16	19
disagree	27	35	48	35

#12 Taking a foreign language class where I must speak is a very frightening experience.

agree	17	23	28	22
uncertain	2	6	4	4
disagree	81	72	68	74

#13 Doing oral classwork makes me feel good.

agree	59	46	32	48
uncertain	17	26	20	21
disagree	25	29	48	32

#14 My mind seems to go blank when I try to speak.

agree	34	37	40	37
uncertain	15	6	0	8
disagree	51	57	60	57

#16 I like to express myself aloud in the foreign language.

agree	59	34	36	45
uncertain	7	29	8	15
disagree	34	37	56	41

#19 I am nervous about speaking in class.

agree	49	57	48	52
uncertain	5	6	0	4
disagree	46	37	52	45

#21 Speaking in class is the activity I enjoy most.

agree	49	26	36	38
uncertain	12	23	8	15
disagree	39	51	56	48

200/Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

#22 I never seem able to express myself clearly in the foreign language.

agree	32	29	28	30
uncertain	17	17	20	18
disagree	51	55	52	53

#23 Speaking in class is a lot of fun.

agree	61	32	36	45
uncertain	12	20	16	16
disagree	27	49	48	40

#27 I have a terrible time expressing myself orally in the foreign language.

agree	17	34	20	24
uncertain	15	11	4	11
disagree	68	54	76	65

#29 It is easy for me to speak in class.

agree	44	37	32	39
uncertain	22	20	16	20
disagree	34	43	52	42

#34 I freeze up when the teacher calls on me to give an oral response.

agree	27	38	32	32
uncertain	20	3	8	7
disagree	64	60	60	61

#36 I would like it if we spoke more often in class.

agree	52	29	28	38
uncertain	15	31	32	25
disagree	34	40	40	38

#37 I would be interested in taking a conversation course in the foreign language.

agree	66	49	52	56
uncertain	17	17	24	29
disagree	17	34	24	25

DISCUSSION

The correlations, chi square, and analysis of variance computed using the predictor variables in the study are most significant in their failure to confirm common expectations. While intuition might lead one to assume that increased experience in language learning would reduce anxiety, correlations indicate only a very slight (-.19 to -.29) negative relationship between anxiety and previous language study which, although significant, accounts for a mere 4-9% of the shared variance. Basically the same may be said of the relationship between anxiety and the subjects' predictions of success in the language classroom. Though one might expect confidence to be associated positively with low anxiety, only moderate (.26 to .47) correlations were revealed, accounting for 7-22% of the shared variance. No significant relationships were found between anxiety and language studied or sex of the learner. Thus, none of the predictor variables appear highly useful in identifying anxious learners. Consequently, a teacher may not assume that students of Spanish, for example, are more prone to anxiety nor that females are more likely than males to be apprehensive in the language class. Foreign language classroom anxiety related to the speaking skill, it seems, is non-selective, affecting subjects in all languages studied, males and females, the confident and not-so-confident, experienced students as well as inexperienced ones. What these findings imply for the language teacher is that the help of devices such as the MSA, rather than intuition alone, may be needed to identify the anxious learner.

The second objective of the study was to analyze subjects' responses to questions related to classroom activities, of upmost importance due to the implications for the communicative approach to language teaching and learning. In the first category of statements related to classroom exercises, a majority of subjects expressed favorable reactions to activities that could be considered proficiency-oriented or student-centered such as group and partner work. Only role-play failed to achieve a 50% approval rate, though it was not far off the mark at 46%. On the other hand, 51% of the subjects expressed discomfort with more traditional and ego-involving activities such as speaking in front of the class but not with oral exercises. Because of their more structured nature and limited

response-type, however, it is *not* surprising that 54% of the subjects felt confident with traditional classroom drills.

Nevertheless, what is most striking in the findings is perhaps the large number of subjects who responded "uncertain" to the statements related to role-play, group, and partner work. The total percent of "uncertain" responses for these three statements ranged from 26-31%, but the total seemed to be skewed by the responses from the French group. Without their responses, "uncertain" answers would have ranged from 30-45%. While it is possible the responses indicate an ambivalence on the part of the subjects toward the activities, it is more likely they reveal an unfamiliarity with these activities. In fact, discussion with the Spanish and German professors indicated the activities had not been utilized in the classes at the time the survey was administered. If these subjects' unfamiliarity with student-centered activities is taken into consideration along with the relatively low percentage of subjects expressing anxiety related to them, the positive response may then be viewed in an even more favorable light; i.e., one might project a higher percentage of positive reactions had all subjects been familiar with the activities. The support received for student-centered activities at the very least suggests they are worthy of consideration by language teachers.

A second group of statement responses concerned subjects' feelings about evaluation of the oral skill. While some statements reflected concern with teacher evaluation (testing), others dealt with the reactions of classmates and friends or self-assessment of the subject's speaking ability.

The most noteworthy response from the reactions related to evaluation suggests that the subjects in this study were highly confident. In spite of the fact that 37-46% of the subjects indicated a fear of oral testing, only 10-11% of them expected to do poorly on an oral exam. This discrepancy may indeed be due to high confidence, though other factors could also have played a role. The reactions may, for example, reflect considerable experience with oral testing (92% of the subjects had studied a foreign language before) or, on the other hand, inexperience with speaking tests (the survey was administered the third week of class and subjects were not queried about their past experience with oral assessment). Another factor that might have influenced subjects' responses may have been an expectation, right or wrong, that the teacher would give students the benefit of the doubt in an oral test situation seen as more subjective than a written exam. In any case, speculation needs to be

supplemented by research soliciting information from subjects about their past experience with oral evaluation and the reasoning behind their responses. The fact remains, however, that many students fear oral assessment, and teachers and researchers would be well advised to seek means of alleviating students anxiety in this regard, especially in light of the uncertainty about the relationship of anxiety and achievement (Steinberg, 1982; Young, 1985; Scott, 1986).

Finally, the remaining statements elicited non-specific expressions of anxiety from the subjects. Since research has uncovered the paradox of students who enjoy speaking in the foreign language even though they also fear it, it is not surprising that upwards of 45% of the subjects gave favorable reactions to statements concerning the speaking skill. However, while educators may take comfort in these numbers, let us not overlook the 30-52% who do *not* look forward to, enjoy, or feel good about speaking aloud (questions 10, 13, 16, 21, 23, 36), who get nervous or tend to freeze up (questions 14, 19, 34), and who do not find it easy to express themselves in the foreign language (questions 22, 29). While learners' reactions may be due largely to unrealistic beliefs or expectations, educators must become more aware of students' anxiety since it can be pivotal in their reactions to the total language learning experience.

CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The results of this study found, as did Horwitz (1988), considerable agreement among students in French, German, and Spanish classes. Though answers from subjects in one language group or another varied considerably on a few questions, responses were, on the whole, quite similar, and no statistical differences were found in anxiety levels of language groups. However, consideration must be given to the characteristics of the sample (non-random; students at a small, private university) and to the cross-sectional nature of the survey before the findings may be extrapolated.

While the results, fortunately, do not indicate an overwhelming number of students experiencing high levels of foreign language classroom anxiety, they do suggest that considerable attention could still be devoted to addressing the anxiety issue. First, since many students express comfort related to pair and small-group work, this type activity shows promise as a means of lowering classroom

stress. Second, more frequent exposure (familiarity) to oral evaluation might reduce the anxiety experienced in relation to assessment even by those who appear confident in their ability. Finally, helping students establish reasonable goals and reassuring them that errors are a normal part of the foreign/second language learning process might help the 30+% who are less than thrilled at the prospect of speaking in the language class.

In addition to studies pinpointing the oral skill, research is also needed that compares students' reactions to activities and assessment in speaking with their feelings about the other skill areas. This information would provide a basis for comparison and would allow a more accurate analysis of the seriousness of anxiety and the oral skill. If the current interest in oral proficiency/communicative competence continues, it is certain that research aimed at identifying anxious learners and alleviating foreign language classroom anxiety should be utilized to encourage students to continue language study beyond the level of lower-division courses.

REFERENCES

- Asher, J. (1977). *Learning another language through action: The complete teacher's guidebook*. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.
- Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: Looking at and through the diary studies. In Herbert W. Seliger & Michael H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition*, pp. 67-102. Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Brown, H. D. (1980). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Curran, C. A. (1976). *Counseling-learning in second languages*. Apple River, IL: Apple River Press.
- Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 9: 242-249.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, Wallace, E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., & Brunet, G. R. (1977). Intensive second language study: Effects on attitudes, motivation, and French achievement. *Language Learning*, 27(2), 243-261.

- Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., Clement, R., & Glicksman, L. (1976). Second language learning: A social-psychological perspective. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32(3), 198-213.
- Gattegno, C. (1976). *The common sense of teaching foreign languages*. NY: Educational Solutions.
- Guiora, A. Z., Beit-Hallahmi, B., Brannon, R. C. L., Dull, C. Y., & Scovel, T. (1972). The effects of experimentally induced changes in ego states on pronunciation ability in a second language: An exploratory study. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 13, 421-428.
- Heyde, A. W. (1979). The relationship between self-esteem and the oral production of a second language (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 16724.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 559-562.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal*, 72 (3), 283-293.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-132.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.
- LaForge, P. (1971). Community language learning: A pilot study. *Language Learning*, 21, 45-61.
- Levitt, E. E. (Ed.). (1980). *The psychology of anxiety*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.
- Lindenau, S. (1987). Issues and answers in foreign language learning: Are students and teachers saying the same thing? *Journal of Educational Techniques and Technologies*, 20, 57-61.
- Lozanov, G. (1978). *Suggestology and outlines of suggestopedy*. NY: Gordon and Breach.
- Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., & Stern, H. H. (1975). *The good language learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Price, M. L. (forthcoming). The subjective experiences of foreign language anxiety: Interviews with anxious students.

- Scott, M. L. (1986). Student affective reactions to oral language tests. *Language Testing*, 3(1), 99-118.
- Steinberg, F. S. (1982). *The relationship between anxiety and oral performance in a foreign language*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
- Swain, M., & Burnaby, B. (1976). Personality characteristics and second language learning in young children: A pilot study. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 11, 115-128.
- Tucker, R., Hamayan E., & Genesee, F. H. (1976). Affective, cognitive and social factors in second language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32(3), 214-226.
- Young, D. J. (1985). *The relationship of anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency interview ratings*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
- Young, D. J. (forthcoming). Anxiety and speaking: From the student's perspective.

How Professors Initiate Nonnative Speakers into their Disciplinary Discourse Communities

DIANE BELCHER

Spack (1988) has offered us a number of reasons why ESL teachers "should leave the teaching of writing in the disciplines to the teachers of those disciplines" (p. 30). Surveys of writing tasks in different disciplines (e.g., Horowitz, 1986; Rose, 1983) have revealed relatively little, Spack notes, about the nature of academic writing. According to Spack, we must do much more ethnographic work—more analysis of actual assignments, student papers, teacher responses, and classroom activities—before we can arrive at a thorough understanding of the type of writing expected of students in their content courses. Spack also points out that ESL teachers who attempt to teach discipline-specific writing may be at a serious disadvantage because they may not fully understand the subject matter of their students' papers. Unlike Freire (1972), who encourages teachers to put themselves on more of an equal footing with their students so that they can learn from and with them, Spack is concerned about the teacher in the "uncomfortable position of being less knowledgeable than students" (p. 37). A related and more serious problem mentioned by Spack has to do with the teacher's ability to serve as facilitator of the student's writing process. How can the writing teacher interact with the student's text, i.e., respond to the ideas in it, as Sommers (1982) and Zamel (1985) have advised, if that text is only partially understood by the teacher? Indeed, not just the subject matter but also the interpretive conventions of other discourse communities, the way they look at subject matter, may prove to be, as Spack remarks, formidable obstacles for the writing teacher who attempts to respond to discipline-specific writing.

What Spack does not take sufficiently into consideration in her argument against the teaching of discipline-specific writing in ESL classes is whether content-area teachers are willing and able to teach writing in the disciplines. Some recent studies on the writing-across-the-curriculum movement (WAC), which are cited by Spack herself, raise disturbing questions about this willingness and ability. In his account of the demise of the WAC programs at Colgate and Berkeley in the 1960's, Russell (1987) remarks that the very nature

of the modern university, especially its research orientation, makes changing faculty attitudes toward writing instruction very difficult. Russell, of course, is suggesting that faculty attitudes toward writing instruction in content-area classes have not generally been positive. Fulwiler (1984) has described faculty resistance to ideas presented in workshops aimed at introducing professors to the benefits and uses of the process approach to writing in the content areas. A professor who is an extremely rapid and efficient writer, Fulwiler has observed, may have difficulty empathizing with students and understanding their need to write multiple drafts of an assignment and receive feedback on them. Large class size is another factor that can discourage professors from giving and responding to writing assignments. Fulwiler has also noted that professors who do devote time to fostering writing in their courses by, for instance, assigning journals or having student conferences may not feel that it is worth the effort, for their institutions reward them for working on their own writing, not for helping others learn to write. Of course, there have been very successful WAC programs, probably most notably at Beaver College and Michigan Technological University; yet, according to Kinneavy (1987), there have been no published systematic evaluations of these programs. The fact that the WAC movement has met with both failure and success, which Spack herself acknowledges (Braine, 1988), certainly makes it difficult to speak with assurance about content-area teachers' commitment to the teaching of writing.

Perhaps even less is known about how content-area teachers help nonnative speakers become writers in the disciplines. Horowitz (1986) analyzed fifty-four writing tasks in content courses at one university and found that they placed more emphasis on recognition and reorganization of data than on invention and personal discovery. Horowitz does not argue that these writing tasks should be different; instead, he suggests that ESL students may not be prepared for such assignments. Bridgeman and Carlson (1983) surveyed faculty in seven disciplines at thirty-four universities and discovered that faculty generally perceived nonnative speakers as poorer writers than native speakers. Curiously, when asked to rank criteria for evaluating writing, the faculty chose such global features as quality of content, organization, and development of ideas as most important. The professors felt that nonnative speakers had no more trouble with these aspects of writing than native speakers did. Nonnative speakers had more sentence-level problems, according to the faculty

respondents. These problems should not have greatly affected the professors' evaluation of nonnative writing, considering their own ranking of grading criteria. Van, Meyer, and Lorenz's study (1984), which asked faculty to rank with respect to acceptability sentence-level errors, found faculty less accepting of typical nonnative speaker errors than of typical native speaker errors (NS errors being such things as misspellings, comma splices, and faulty pronoun agreement; NNS errors being problems with word order, it-deletion, tense, relative clause structure, and word choice). Two other studies, which actually asked faculty to respond to nonnative speaker essays, resulted in somewhat contradictory findings. Mendelsohn and Cumming (1987) had engineering professors, English professors, and ESL teachers evaluate essays on a general topic written by nonnative speaker engineering students. The results indicated that the engineering professors were the most sensitive to language errors, that is, the most likely to penalize papers for them, even when the content was well organized. The ESL teachers were the least likely to be bothered by language errors. Santos (1988), in a study also using nonnative speaker essays on general topics but soliciting response from faculty in numerous disciplines, found content-area professors generally able to yield quite separate judgments of content and language use, except in the case of lexical errors, which directly affect meaning.

None of the studies I have discussed so far tells us specifically how content-area professors respond to nonnative speaker writing in the disciplines, or how such professors help nonnative speakers become writers in their fields. If we know little about how professors actually handle writing in their content classes, how can we make an informed decision about whether or not to "leave the teaching of writing in the disciplines to the teachers of those disciplines" (Spack, 1988, p. 30)?

GOALS AND METHODS

In my own study, I have attempted to investigate how content-area professors initiate nonnative speakers into their disciplinary discourse communities by focusing on international graduate students who have had some experience with writing in their fields. International graduate students should be a population of interest to us in ESL since they now constitute 44% of all international college students in the United States (Zikopoulos, 1987). At the university

surveyed in this study, a large research institution, 80% of the 2,800 international students are graduate students. Graduate students should also be of special interest and concern to us because their need to become members of disciplinary discourse communities is more immediate than that of undergraduates.

In order to discover what kind of help students received or sought, how they perceived their professors as responding to their writing, and what they thought most helped them become writers in their disciplines, I distributed a questionnaire to 200 of the approximately 720 first-year international graduate students at the university under study, i.e., those in the midst of initiation into their disciplinary discourse community. For this pilot study, the questionnaires were given out in ESL classes; thus my sample is a cluster sample, not randomly selected students, and not easily amenable to confidence limit assessment or inferential statistics (Lauer & Asher, 1988). Of the 200 students who received the questionnaire, 184 responded. All but 20 of these respondents had already had some experience with writing assignments in their fields at the graduate level. From these 164 experienced writers, I chose 14 students to interview from a broad range of fields:

	<u>N</u>
Business	1
Education	3
Engineering	3
Geodetic Science	1
Journalism	1
Linguistics	1
Microbiology	1
Nutrition	2
Political Science	1

These students agreed to show me writing assignments they had received in their content-area courses, describe problems they had responding to these assignments, and discuss their reactions to graded papers which they would also allow me to examine.

SURVEY RESULTS

The results of this survey indicate that the respondents have had very little time to become acculturated — as American college

students, as graduate students, or as field-specific writers. Of the 184 students who responded to the questionnaire, only 10.9% said that they had written no papers so far, while 51.6% reported that they had had to write one to four papers per academic quarter and 33.2% wrote more than five per quarter. Thus, 84.8% said that they were expected to write papers in their field during their first year in graduate school at their current university.

As for the writing assignments themselves, well over half of the respondents who had written papers in their fields ($N=164$) reported that they usually received written prompts for paper assignments. But note that (see Table 1) more than a quarter of the 164 students, 28.1%, said that they did not usually receive assignment sheets.

Table 1
Professors' Facilitation of Writing ($N=164$)

	Usually	Never	Some- times	No Response
1. Assignment prompts provided	53.6%	28.1%	15.2%	3.0%
2. Assignments orally explained in class	58.5%	28.1%	11.6%	1.8%
3. Early drafts encouraged	32.3%	57.3%	8.0%	2.4%

Professors are somewhat more likely, according to 58.5% of the students, to give oral explanations of paper assignments in class, either in lieu of or in addition to assignment sheets. It may be reassuring to know that an even higher percentage of students, 64% (see Table 2), at least claimed to feel free to question professors in class about assignments, and over 50% said that they visited professors in their offices to discuss their papers. Less reassuring is the fact that only 32.3% of the students surveyed felt that their professors encouraged them to hand in early drafts of papers. One student even wrote on his questionnaire, "Professors are busy people. They don't have time." Nevertheless, 46.3% of the students said that they do, in fact, write more than one draft, although they may not show them to anyone. As for seeking peer help with assignments, well over half, 54.3%, said that they

discussed assignments with other graduate students. Hence, they were about as likely to talk to fellow students as to faculty. Yet only 18.9% said that they would show a draft of a paper to another student. A majority of the students, 63.4%, thought that they understood why they received the grades that they had on their papers. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that they were pleased with those grades.

Table 2
Students' Response to Assignments: From Prompt to
Graded Product (N=164)

	Usually	Never	Some- times	No Response
1. Question professors about assignments in class	64.0%	27.4%	7.3%	1.2%
2. Discuss work-in-progress with professors during office hours	54.3%	33.5%	11.0%	1.2%
3. Discuss assignments with other students	54.3%	28.1%	15.2%	2.4%
4. Write more than one draft per assignment	46.3%	43.9%	6.1%	3.7%
5. Share drafts with fellow students	18.9%	70.7%	7.3%	3.1%
6. Understand grades on papers	63.4%	20.7%	8.5%	7.3%

What students perceived as being important to professors (given the choices indicated in Table 3), that is, most often commented on in papers, and thus features of their writing that they needed to attend to, were, first of all, their reasoning. Fifty-three percent thought that application of theories, choice of methodology,

understanding of implications, or some other aspect of the reasoning evident in their papers was important to professors. The second most frequently commented on feature according to the students (49.4%) was their own ideas. Only a third of the students said that professors commented on the organization or grammar of their papers. Even fewer (27.4%) reported that their knowledge of literature on their topics was commented on. Word choice was thought by the students to be the least likely feature (25.6%) to be commented on by professors.

Table 3

Students' Perceptions of What Professors Comment On (N=164)

	Usually	Never	Some-times	No Response
1. Student's own ideas	49.4%	48.2%	—	2.4%
2. Knowledge of literature on topic	27.4%	70.1%	—	2.4%
3. Reasoning	53.0%	43.9%	.6%	2.4%
4. Organization	32.3%	64.6%	.6%	2.4%
5. Grammar	34.8%	62.8%	—	2.4%
6. Word Choice	25.6%	72.0%	—	2.4%

What students most often cited (78.1%) as helping them learn to write in their fields (given the choices listed in Table 4) was reading books and articles in their field. The survey does not tell us how the students thought reading helped their writing, e.g., by broadening their knowledge base in the field, by improving their vocabulary, by making them more familiar with academic genres, or all of these. Help from professors was far less often cited (40.2%). Interestingly, although, as pointed out earlier, 54.3% said that they talked to their professors during office hours about their papers, only about half that, 26.8%, considered office hour discussion with professors helpful. ESL writing classes were somewhat more frequently mentioned as beneficial. Least frequently cited as helpful were all items involving peers--discussion with fellow students

(19.5%), reading fellow students' papers (17.7%), and student feedback on drafts (16.5%). Thus, two of the items involving professors' help were ranked higher than assistance from ESL classes and peers, but not nearly as high as just reading in the field.

Table 4
Students' Perceptions of What Helped Them Learn
to Write in Their Fields (N=164)

	Usually	Never	Some- times	No Response
1. Reading books and articles in field	78.1%	20.7%	.6%	.6%
2. Professors' instruction/ advice in class	40.2%	57.9%	1.2%	.6%
3. Office-hour discussion with professors	26.8%	71.3%	.6%	1.2%
4. Discussion with fellow students	19.5%	79.3%	.6%	.6%
5. Student feedback on drafts	16.5%	82.3%	.6%	.6%
6. Professors' comments on papers	40.2%	57.9%	1.2%	.6%
7. Reading fellow students' papers	17.7%	81.1%	.6%	.6%
8. ESL writing classes	28.1%	70.7%	.6%	.6%

INTERVIEW RESULTS

In many ways my interviews revealed much more than the questionnaires about how the students see themselves becoming initiated into their disciplinary discourse communities. The fourteen

interviewees not only had the opportunity to explain the reasoning behind their questionnaire responses but also, because the interview format was largely unstructured, to volunteer other perceptions of themselves as novice writers in their fields and of the help they do or do not receive. The actual assignment sheets and the completed and in-progress papers that the interviewees shared with me also served as catalysts for questions that I had not even considered in my formulation of the questionnaire.

Professors as Writing Facilitators

With respect to professors' handling of paper assignments, there was no consistency in the assignment prompts that the interviewees showed me. They ranged from the very sketchy, simply suggesting several topics, to the extremely detailed, as long as five pages, with precise format instructions. The longest assignment sheets were for problem-solving assignments. Although 58.5% of the questionnaire respondents said that professors explained assignments in class, some interviewees noted that such explanations could consist of little more than a restatement of what was on the assignment sheet. When asked how they felt about their professors' policies regarding early drafts, several of the interviewees remarked that they were actually pleased that their professors did not want to see multiple drafts. These students said that they never had time for more than one draft, either because it took them so long to do the reading for their papers or to gather the necessary data. One student mentioned that he had had to spend twenty hours running his computer program to obtain data for an assignment. He was then left with less than a day to write the paper. While a majority of the students surveyed said that they did feel free to question professors about assignments, about a third of the students interviewed asked me questions about papers they were working on, questions that they appeared to be unwilling to ask their professors. These questions tended to be either about genres, e.g., how to write an abstract or what a proposal introduction should look like, or about library search strategies, i.e., how to find more literature on their topics, and more specifically, how to use such resources as printed indexes and CD ROM. The distinction in the survey results between the percentage of students reporting that they went to professors offices to discuss assignments and the much smaller percentage who found office-hour discussion with professors useful was partially explained in the interviews when students told me that they often

could not understand what their professors said to them. One student thought that the problem was not the result of poor listening comprehension skills but of the "abstract concepts" used by the professors. Another student reported that he was told by his professor to come back to his office when he knew more about his topic. The student never went back.

Peer Support

Regarding peers, a majority of the students mentioned in the interviews that they discussed assignments with classmates. Only two, however, said that they had actually been able to look at papers written by friends who had taken the same courses. Plagiarism did not seem to have been these students' intention; they hoped, rather, for a better understanding of their professors' expectations. One student reported that one of her professors kept files of student papers which current students were invited to read. She felt that being able to read these papers helped her immensely. While most of the interviewees wanted the opportunity to see other students' papers, only two said that they showed drafts of their own papers to peers. These two mainly sought editorial help. They routinely gave their drafts to friends that they regarded as especially knowledgeable about English.

Grades

Perhaps out of modesty or a general lack of confidence, interviewees who had received high grades on papers frequently confided in me that their grades were higher than they deserved. They said that their teachers were just being kind to nonnative speakers. These students felt that their language use did not really merit high grades and/or that they had relied too heavily on sources. Students who had received what they, as graduate students, considered low grades, i.e., less than a B+, blamed the time factor or their language use, even if their professors claimed to be more interested in content than anything else. These latter students were convinced that they were unable to do justice to their own thoughts when they expressed them in English.

Professors' Comments

The interviewees expressed little reluctance to let me look at professors' comments on their graded papers. In fact, most appeared eager to have me help them interpret the comments. About one fourth of the interviewees said that they could not even read the handwriting on their graded papers but would not ask their professors for help. Approximately half of the faculty comments on ideas and reasoning struck me as overly vague. The only comment on one paper was "Fine presentation, very informative." When the comments were both vague and negative, the students usually were at a loss. One student remarked about a comment, viz., "You're wrong here," that he thought he was right, but the professor must have some higher knowledge. Organization appeared to be a problematic feature mainly for the non-science students, that is, those in fields with no single agreed-upon discourse paradigm. Student perceptions in the survey about grammar not often being commented on seemed borne out by my analysis of the interviewees' graded papers. Some papers contained no comments on grammar at all, despite the presence of errors. Those papers that did contain comments on the grammar, either were under- or over-marked. Whole sentences would be underlined with the accompanying comment "wrong grammar," which mystified the student-author. Or, there would be wholesale appropriation of text, entire lines of text crossed out and rewritten with no consulting of the student for meaning or intention and no explanation of what the professor thought was wrong with the student text. In one case, only grammar on the first page was marked, seemingly indicating that the professor decided there were too many errors to mark or that he just stopped reading. This did not send a positive message to the student. Word choice, which questionnaire respondents had reported as infrequently commented on, was only occasionally marked on the papers shown me. However, professors' general complaints about "poor grammar" might also actually refer to problems with vocabulary deployment since matching the appropriate syntactic frames with newly acquired lexical items, or getting the right collocation, is often very difficult for nonnative speakers (Rutherford, 1988). In the interviews, students often complained to me about their inability to find the right words and worried about resorting to thinking in their first language in such

situations, something that they perceived to be a hindrance rather than a help.

Advisors' Roles

The interviews gave a very different perspective from that of the survey on what most helps students learn to write in their fields. Little was said in the interviews about reading as an aid to writing, but much was said about the ill effects of not being able to find sources or of not having enough time to read those found. What was most enthusiastically pointed to in the interviews as helping students become writers in their fields was the advisor/student relationship. The advisor-as-mentor was not revealed as a significant source of help by the survey since there was no item on the questionnaire that specifically asked about it. In the interviews, students who had advisors who were interested in them and their work noted that they received a great deal of attention and support from them. These students felt comfortable asking their advisors about their writing. One student mentioned being discouraged by a professor she had for a content course from visiting his office. According to the professor, graduate students should be able to work on their own. This student had no qualms, however, about consulting her advisor, who never made her feel incompetent or indolent when she asked for help. Another student, who had failed an advanced ESL composition course, reported that she was in the process of writing a primary research report that her advisor assured her would be publishable. Her advisor led her every step of the way, modeling the writing process for her by showing her exactly how he went about composing a research report. This same advisor held weekly lab meetings for all his advisees at which they were expected to discuss their latest findings and were counseled on how to determine their significance. Other students looked forward to the guidance they would receive from their advisors when they started work on their thesis or dissertation. An advisor's help may not always serve the nonnative speaker well, however. One student remarked that he was grateful to his advisor for completely rewriting his paper for him, but felt that he still did not really know how to write acceptable papers in his field. In this case it appeared that the advisor, although perhaps well intentioned, may have been more concerned about how this graduate student's work would reflect on him, the advisor, than on helping the student become an independent scholar.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Since most of the content-area professors that my questionnaire respondents came into contact with did not invite or allow submission of a series of drafts for an assignment, it appears that most of them have not yet made a commitment to teaching the writing process in their fields. This finding should not be surprising considering, once again, what we know of the checkered history of the WAC movement in America. Fulwiler (1984) has pointed out that WAC has generally been unsuccessful at large research-oriented universities, where responding to student writing has to compete with many other demands on professors' time. Nor is it surprising that many content-area professors may not be enlightened about or interested in using the process approach to writing in their classes when we consider that there are composition teachers who are still relatively untouched by recent composition theory. Zamel (1985) has criticized ESL composition teachers in particular for behaving too much like language teachers and not enough like writing facilitators. When she examined ESL teacher responses to 105 student texts, Zamel found that the teachers usually treated the papers as finished products rather than as drafts that could be improved with teacher encouragement and advice. The teachers also attended less to the global features of the texts than to sentence-level errors. According to my survey results, content-area professors are more likely to respond to students' ideas and reasoning than to their language, and hence to interact with student texts more in the manner that Zamel recommends than the ESL teachers she studied. Yet, other studies, such as Mendelsohn and Cumming's (1987), discussed earlier, have found content-area professors extremely sensitive to language errors. It would seem to be a truism, however, that teachers in a discipline would be better equipped to respond to the content of student writing in that discipline than would teachers outside of the discipline, e.g., ESL teachers. Nevertheless, no matter how well the content-area professors respond to content, if they only respond to the content of final drafts, then they cannot be said to be teaching the writing process in their fields.

Judging by my survey respondents' unwillingness to share drafts with peers, it appears that their content-area professors, do not encourage them to seek out responses from fellow students

during the drafting process. Of course, the competitiveness of graduate school could be another explanation for the students' apparent guardedness. In any case, my survey suggests that peer feedback is generally not highly valued by first-year international graduate students at one university. If the students were to receive more feedback from other international graduate students, it is difficult to say how much the students would be able to benefit from it. In one of the few empirical studies on peer response to ESL writing, Partridge (1981) concluded, with the help of holistic scorers, that ESL student essays were more likely to improve as a result of teacher than of peer response. Although Gaies (1985) has found in his review of the literature on peer involvement that it is usually very effective in ESL classes, he questions the value of peer work for highly complex, open-ended tasks such as composing. Mittan (1989), on the other hand, is convinced that peer review has been invaluable in the ESL writing classes he has taught. Mittan notes, however, as have many first language (L1) compositionists (see Huff & Kline, 1987), that students may need much guided practice as reviewers before they become effective respondents to each others' essays. A research question certainly worth pursuing is whether students trained as peer reviewers in their ESL writing classes are more willing to seek and better able to benefit from peer feedback in their content courses than those without such training.

My survey respondents seem to instinctively appreciate what second language (L2) researchers have only fairly recently begun to examine--the strength of the reading/writing connection. Among L1 reading researchers, it has been known for some time now that there is a positive correlation between amount of reading done and writing proficiency, i.e., the more reading, the better the writer (see Fader & McNeil, 1968; Thorndike, 1973). But not until the past few years, according to Janopoulos (1986), have there been any attempts to find empirical evidence for the same correlation in L2 learners. In Janopoulos' own study, which focused exclusively on international graduate students, those with higher L2 writing proficiency did report that they had done much more pleasure reading in L2 than did students with lower writing proficiency. The next logical step would seem to be to investigate the relationship between amount of serious reading in one's discipline (e.g., for courses, general exams, or a thesis) and writing proficiency in that discipline. Many L1 and L2 compositionists, including Bazerman (1980), Salvatori (1983), and Spack (1985), are, however, already quite convinced of the interconnectedness of writing and reading. "Reading provides

not only a model for writing and a provocation to write but also the very occasion and situation for most writing. Without a sense of the continuity between statements, between reading and writing, students can learn only to create voices calling, and being lost, in the wilderness," Bazerman (1989, p. ix) has observed. International graduate students themselves have considered ability to read field-specific journal articles and papers crucial to academic success at the graduate level, according to a survey conducted almost a decade before mine (Ostler, 1980). Yet, it is probably safe to say that while content-area professors do not automatically assume that their students can write, they do assume that they can read, and thus are not likely to attempt to teach them how to read in the disciplines.

Perhaps the most intriguing and unanticipated finding of my study is the great faith that many of the students that I interviewed have in the advisor/student relationship. I know of no studies of the role played by content-area advisors in the initiation of their nonnative speaker advisees into their disciplinary discourse communities. My interviewees' confidence in the efficacy of their relationships with their advisors certainly raises many questions: Do non-native speakers consciously seek graduate advisors who will be sympathetic and supportive? How do they find these mentors? How do advisors become good mentors for nonnative speakers? Or, does effective mentoring of nonnative speakers in fact differ from that of native speakers? To what extent is content-area advisor mentoring responsible for L2 students' success as writers in their fields? It may be, as suggested earlier, that good intentions and knowledge of the field are not enough. The advisor of one of my interviewees admitted to me that he felt stymied in his efforts to help a very bright advisee with low overall L2 proficiency. James (1984), an ESL tutor at a British university, discovered while serving as "language supervisor" for a dissertation writer that there were many problems in this student's sociology of medicine dissertation--ranging from faulty pronoun referencing to an inappropriate style influenced by a heavily politicized L1 rhetorical tradition--that he had to help the student address. James found himself "often amazed" at the language-related problems that the content-area advisor either was not bothered by or chose to ignore (p. 100).

Spack (1988) is right to caution ESL teachers about the difficulties of teaching writing in the disciplines. Obviously, we cannot respond to discipline-specific writing with the same ease and in the same manner as members of other disciplinary interpretive

communities do. Yet, case studies such as James' show us that even very advanced-level student documents can be intelligently responded to by ESL teachers. Compositionists such as Bazerman (1988) and Halloran (1984) have demonstrated how much of the language and rhetoric of writing in fields as highly specialized as optics and molecular biology can be comprehended and appreciated using "the typical repertoire of the English department," (Bazerman, 1988, p. 3). Composition theory in general appears to be moving away from viewing text as the expression of a single author's thoughts, embodying a single voice, toward a more social constructionist, contextual view of text (Phelps, 1989). Writing teachers are now being encouraged to read student texts as "embedded in and interpenetrating many other discourses" (Phelps, 1989, p. 55). Bartholomae (1986) has observed that students naturally try out many voices and roles when they enter a new discourse community. Can we justify limiting our students' writing to discourses that we are familiar with by arguing that we need to completely understand the subject matter of their texts in order to respond to them? Of course, if we do invite students to write about fields of knowledge that they are attempting to master, we may have to rely on our students as informants (Belcher, 1988; Braine, 1988), to allow them to teach us, a situation which may indeed make some teachers uncomfortable (Spack, 1988). It may well be easier to leave the teaching of writing in various discourses to content-area professors like sociologist Howard Becker. Faced with the task of teaching a writing class to graduate students in sociology, Becker (1986) realized that he had no idea how to teach writing, despite the fact that he had been producing published articles in his field for thirty years. Reflecting on his years of problem-solving as a writer, Becker invented a way to talk about and teach writing, before he discovered that there was a wealth of literature on the subject in a field he had never heard of — composition theory. Becker has since then delved into that literature and also developed his own theory of writing based on research in sociological social psychology (Becker, 1982). My preliminary study on professors' initiation of students into their disciplinary discourse communities suggests that content-area teachers like Howard Becker are the exception to the rule.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am especially grateful to Eli Hinkel, Robert Kantor, and Terence Odlin for their advice during the early stages of this study and to George Braine and Ulla Connor for their valuable critiques of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Bartholomae, D. (1986). Inventing the university. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 5, 4-23.
- Bazerman, C. (1980). A relationship between reading and writing: The conversational model. *College English*, 41, 656-661.
- Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bazerman, C. (1989). *The informed writer: Using sources in the disciplines*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Becker, H. S. (1982). *Art worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1986). *Writing for social scientists: How to start and finish your thesis, book, or article*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Belcher, D. D. (1988, March). Using peer review in the advanced EAP composition classroom. Paper presented at the 22nd Annual TESOL Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Braine, G. (1988). A reader reacts . . . [in The Forum]. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 700-702.
- Bridgeman, B., & Carlson, S. (1983). *Survey of academic writing tasks required of graduate and undergraduate foreign students*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Fader, D., & McNeil, E. (1968). *Hooked on books: Program and proof*. New York: Putnam.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. M. B. Ramos (Trans.). New York: Herder & Herder.
- Fulwiler, T. (1984). How well does writing across the curriculum work? *College English*, 46, 113-125.
- Gaies, S. J. (1985). *Peer involvement in language learning*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

- Halloran, S. M. (1984). The birth of molecular biology: An essay in the rhetorical criticism of scientific discourse. *Rhetoric Review*, 3, 70-83.
- Horowitz, D. (1986). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 445-462.
- Huff, R., & Kline, C. R. (1987). *The contemporary writing curriculum: Rehearsing, composing and valuing*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- James, K. (1984). The writing of theses by speakers of English as a foreign language: The results of a case study. In R. Williams, J. Swales, & J. Kirkman (Eds.), *Common ground: Shared interests in ESP and communication studies* (pp. 99-113). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Janopoulos, M. (1986). The relationship of pleasure reading and second language writing proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 763-768.
- Kinneavy, J. L. (1987). Writing across the curriculum. In G. Tate (Ed.), *Teaching composition: Twelve bibliographic essays* (pp. 353-377). Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.
- Lauer, J. M., & Asher, J. W. (1988). *Composition research: Empirical designs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mendelsohn, D., & Cumming, A. (1987, April). Professors' ratings of language use and rhetorical organization in ESL compositions. Paper presented at the 21st Annual TESOL Convention, Miami, FL.
- Mittan, R. (1989, March). A peer review process for ESL composition: Some whys and some ways. Paper presented at the 40th meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Seattle, WA.
- Ostler, S. (1980). A survey of academic needs for advanced ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 489-502.
- Partridge, K. L. (1981). A comparison of the effectiveness of peer vs. teacher evaluation for helping students of English as a second language to improve the quality of their written compositions. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Phelps, L. W. (1989). Images of student writing: The deep structure of teacher response. In C. M. Anson (Ed.), *Writing and response: Theory, practice, and research* (pp. 37-67). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Rose, M. (1983). Remedial writing courses: A critique and a proposal. *College English*, 45, 109-126.

- Russell, D. R. (1987). Writing across the curriculum and the communications movement: Some lessons from the past. *College English*, 38, 184-194.
- Rutherford, W. (1988). *Second language grammar: Learning and teaching*. London: Longman.
- Salvatori, M. (1983). Reading and writing a text: Correlations between reading writing patterns. *College English* 45, 657-666.
- Santos, T. (1988). Professors' reactions to the academic writing of nonnative-speaking students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 69-90.
- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 148-156.
- Spack, R. (1985). Literature, reading, writing, and ESL: Bridging the gaps. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 703-725.
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 29-51.
- Thorndike, R. L. (1973). *Reading comprehension education in 15 countries (International Studies in Evaluation III)*. New York: Halsted Press.
- Vann, R. J., Meyer, D. E., & Lorenz, F. O. (1984). Error gravity: A study of faculty opinion of ESL errors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 427-440.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-101.
- Zikopoulos, M. (Ed.). (1987). *Open doors 1987-1988: Report on international exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Three Perspectives on Composing in a Second Language

VICTORIA COBB

INTRODUCTION

Theory and research in second-language composition is influenced by theory and research in both first-language (L1) composition and second language (L2) acquisition/learning. In "Nonacademic Writing: The Social Perspective" (Faigley, 1985), Faigley identifies three perspectives for writing research: the text perspective, the individual perspective and the social perspective. Similarly, L2 acquisition/learning research focuses alternately on the language system to be learned, the individual learner, or language used in context. Both these fields seem to have developed along roughly similar lines over the past thirty years, reflecting developments in linguistic theory (although not always directly) in shifting from a focus on the text or linguistic system to either a focus on the individual's tacit knowledge or a focus on the social function of language. In this paper the development of L2 composition is traced in light of developments in these related fields. It is argued that, although there may be good reasons for limiting one's theoretical or research perspective, teaching practice requires attention to all these elements since all play a role in our use of language.

TEXT PERSPECTIVE

As Saussure says in his Course in General Linguistics, language "has its seat in the brain". Unfortunately, it is impossible to see language in the brain, and thus we must find other ways to investigate it. One method is to limit the investigation to an examination of the physical manifestation of a language (i.e., the utterances produced by speakers of the language). This data-based methodology was the methodology employed by American structuralist linguistics from the 1930s to the 1950s. Implicit to this approach to the study of language is the assumption that only a

study of the data can be objective and reliable. We cannot possibly know what happens in the mind, and thus our inquiries should be restricted to the study of directly observable behavior. Current-traditional rhetoric in composition and the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis in L2 acquisition might be said to employ similar assumptions.

The chief assumption of current-traditional rhetoric is "the Romantic conviction that the creative aspects of the process are mysterious, inscrutable, and hence unteachable" (Freedman et al., 1983). Thus according to proponents of this model, the business of teaching rhetoric must be restricted to the teaching of the formal aspects of composition. Emphasis is on the composed product rather than the unteachable composing process. Characteristic of this approach to composition teaching is the analysis of discourse into words, sentences, and paragraphs; the classification of discourse; and an emphasis on proper usage and style (Young, 1978). Students learn to compose by analyzing a model finished product and trying to imitate it.

Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) operates under a different sort of assumption, but the resulting focus on the material to be learned rather than on the learner is similar. Adopting the behaviorist model of learning accepted by American structural linguists, the proponents of CAH believe that language learning, like other kinds of learning, is brought about by practice and reinforcement. People, like animals, can be trained to behave in a given manner. Language is a behavior. Therefore people can be trained to produce it, provided the behavior is sufficiently reinforced. *How* the human mind accomplishes the task of acquiring behaviors is not objectively knowable, and thus is not a legitimate object of study. It is sufficient to know that it does acquire them. This rather simplistic view of learning means that pedagogy is fairly simple and formulaic. The difficult part of language teaching becomes deciding *what* is to be taught, not *how*. The solution proposed by CAH was that the language learner needed to learn those aspects of the L2 that were different from the L1. Thus research needed to focus on the languages (the product), not the way people learn (the process).

The model of L2 composition that emerged at the point when these two paradigms reigned in L2 acquisition and in composition was Robert Kaplan's contrastive rhetoric. Kaplan pointed out that more was involved in writing than sentence level grammar. From examining advanced nonnative students' writing, he discovered that

often, although the grammar was correct, the compositions were next to incomprehensible. He proposed that the reason for this was that the rhetorical patterns used in the students' native language were different from the rhetorical patterns used in English, and thus there was a negative transfer from L1 composition to L2 composition (Kaplan, 1966).

The implication of contrastive rhetoric for both teaching and research was, again, an emphasis on the written product rather than on the writer. The pedagogy Kaplan proposed was in keeping with the pedagogies of the proponents of both the current-traditional rhetoric of L1 composition and the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. Students of L2 composition must be taught the rhetorical patterns of English, and "the only efficient way of accomplishing such teaching in rhetoric, just as in syntax, is by way of a series of models that are imitated and by way of a movement from absolute control to relative de-control" (Kaplan, 1968). The research methodology he recommended (and employed) to confirm his hypothesis consisted of examining the rhetorical patterns evident in traditional texts in a given language, and then studying the L2 compositions of students' from that language background to see if their native language rhetorical patterns surfaced in these L2 compositions.

Two studies performed by Kaplan lend support to his hypothesis. In one he looked at the Chinese Eight-Legged Essay, a rhetorical form which was used on the Chinese civil service examinations for five hundred years. After analyzing the form of this type of essay, he compared it to the English compositions of several native Chinese speakers. He found that the organization of these compositions resembled that of the Eight-Legged Essay more closely than that of a typical English essay (Kaplan, 1968). In the other, he found by studying the Koran that elaborate parallelism is used frequently in Arabic written discourse, while subordination is preferred in English. His examination of a composition by a native speaker of Arabic indicated that the tendency to use parallelism rather than subordination had been transferred into this writer's English compositions (Kaplan, 1967).

While the above studies support Kaplan's views, several studies contradict his hypothesis either directly or indirectly.

In their study of the writing of native speakers of Chinese, Mohan and Au-Yeung Lo (1985) contested the claim that the Eight-Legged Essay was in any way a central form in Chinese writing since the classical *wen-yen* style, of which this essay form is a part,

has now been replaced by the spoken language (*bai-hua*) style in Chinese education. They proposed that developmental factors and previous instruction influenced the compositions of their subjects more than transfer from the L1.

Doushaq (1986) compared English and Arabic compositions written by 96 Jordanian students and found that the holistic scores on the Arabic compositions were very close to the holistic scores on the English compositions, indicating that the students' ability to write in their L1 influenced their ability to write in L2. The scores for both languages were uniformly low, which Doushaq attributed to poor education in composition in the L1. Interestingly, of the four groups that Doushaq examined (one group of first-year university students in science, one of second-year English majors, one of fourth-year English majors, and one of fourth-year Arabic majors) the group that scored highest on the Arabic compositions was not the Arabic majors, but the fourth-year English majors. Doushaq proposed that this was due to a reverse transfer of the skills learned in English composition back to the students' native Arabic. This would seem to indicate that composition skills transfer positively from one language to another, rather than negatively as Kaplan hypothesized. Two other studies which compared the L1 and L2 compositions of the same subjects (Edelsky, 1982; Tetroe and Jones, 1987) also found evidence of positive transfer of writing skills from the L1 to the L2.

Positive transfer does not rule out negative transfer, but these studies do seem to indicate that negative transfer of the L1 patterns of rhetoric to writing in the L2 is not the only source of problems for L2 writers, or even the most important one. Problems might be just as likely to arise due to poor education in L1 composition as to different styles of rhetoric in the L1. While we perhaps cannot assume that students who write well in their L1 will write well in their L2, we should definitely not assume that all L2 students write well in their L1.

INDIVIDUAL PERSPECTIVE

In his article *Chomsky's Revolution in Linguistics*, John Searle draws a distinction between two views on the study of man:

Throughout the history of the study of man there has been a fundamental opposition between those who believe that progress is to be made by a

rigorous observation of man's actual behavior and those who believe that such observations are interesting only in so far as they reveal to us hidden and possibly fairly mysterious underlying laws that only partially and in distorted form reveal themselves to us in behavior... Noam Chomsky is unashamedly with the searchers after hidden laws. (Searle, 1972)

While those in the former category might argue that no more than a rigorous observation is objectively and scientifically possible, those in the latter category would argue that this observation in and of itself is pointless. The shift in attention from product to process in L1 composition¹ and from language to language learner in second language acquisition that occurred in the 1960s and 70s might be usefully seen in this vein. While the creative aspects of the writing process may be mysterious and inscrutable, it is precisely these aspects that are at the center of writing, and thus it is these aspects that are most worthy of study. By the same token, while a contrastive study of the language structures in the target and native languages can (apparently) be more objective than a study of how a person becomes able to communicate in a foreign language, the latter concern could be seen to be more central to language learning. In this way, the limits of what is knowable are stretched by what is worth knowing.

The "Chomskyan revolution" and work done in first language acquisition led to new lines of inquiry in second language acquisition. The contrastive analysis hypothesis was thrown into question by studies that indicated that L2 learners acquired morphemes in a particular order regardless of their native language (e.g., Dulay and Burt, 1974). This coincided with a common dissatisfaction with the results of language teaching at the time. Students who performed well in class were unable to communicate in real life situations. These practical and theoretical considerations brought about new theories of language learning which advocated paying more attention to meaning and taking into account attitudes and motivations (e.g., Krashen's Monitor Model). If students were to acquire a second language, they would have to *use* the language in a meaningful way, not just study its structure or mimic its sounds.

¹ Cognitive psychology, the dominant influence on process models in L1 writing research, rejected Chomskyan linguistics long before such models came into existence. I am attempting to show a parallel development here rather than to suggest that any more direct relationship exists between these two fields.

The increasing number of college graduates who could not write led to a similar questioning of the underlying assumptions of the current-traditional rhetoric. As Hairston put it:

We cannot teach students to write by looking only at what they have written. We must also understand how that product came into being and why it assumed the form that it did. We have to try to understand what goes on during the internal act of writing and we have to intervene during the act of writing if we want to affect its outcome. We have to do the hard thing, examine the intangible process, rather than easy thing, evaluate the tangible product (Hairston, 1982, p. 84).

Research into the writing process and attention to invention were the results of this interest in the "internal act of writing".

Determining what it is that someone does when they write is not an easy task. It is impossible to have any direct knowledge of someone else's thought processes. To get around this problem, researchers have developed various indirect methods for studying the writing process. One method is to interview people about their experience. While this can give us some information, it is not the most reliable technique because people don't necessarily remember exactly what they do and think as they write, and because their memory can be distorted by what they think they ought to have done. Another method is to have people think aloud into a tape recorder as they write. This takes care of the memory problem, but it introduces a new problem, in that it distorts the writing task itself. A third method is to observe people writing or to videotape them writing. Finally, one can simply examine the products produced in a controlled experiment, including all notes and revisions. All of these methods and combinations of them have been used to research the writing processes of native speakers.

From the results of the research, we can draw tentative conclusions about the nature of the writing process. Most studies indicate that the traditional linear prewrite, write and rewrite model of composing is flawed (e.g., Sommers, 1980; Pianko, 1979; Perl, 1979). Instead, writers seem to employ a recursive process, in which planning, writing and revising are all used throughout the writing process. Flower and Hayes (1981) use the analogy of a tool kit to describe how the different skills are used during writing; writers use "planning", "translating" and "reviewing" skills and subskills as they are needed at any point during the process. A related generalization that can be made on the basis of these studies

is that writers tend to discover what they want to say as they go along, rather than starting out with a firm plan and then executing it. For example, in one study the mean prewriting time (time before anything is written down) for a group of college freshman was found to be 1.26 minutes (Pianko, 1979).

Findings from studies of the composing processes of unskilled writers and those comparing the composing processes of unskilled writers to those of skilled and/or expert writers can help to give us an idea of what aspects of their writing process unskilled writers need to work on. While the writing processes of unskilled writers are similar to those of their skilled counterparts in many ways (Perl, 1979), there are certain interesting differences. Unskilled writers tend to make fewer changes in their writing than skilled writers, and the changes they do make are usually superficial, while the changes skilled writers make are often changes affecting meaning (Witte and Faigely, 1983; Perl, 1979; Sommers, 1980). Perl (1980) found that the unskilled writers she studied became bogged down in the mechanics of writing. Similarly, Pianko (1979) found that the traditional students she studied were more concerned with getting their ideas across, while the remedial students were more worried about mechanics and usage. From these findings, the authors of these studies conclude that successful writers seem to attend more to meaning than to form. This conclusion, they argue, supports the view that instruction in composition needs to include instruction in invention.

A problem with the conclusion that unskilled writers should be encouraged to adopt the habits of skilled writers is that the unskilled writers might be paying too much attention to mechanics not because they have formed the wrong hypotheses about what writing involves, but because they are at a developmental stage in their writing which requires them to pay attention to mechanics. Advocates of a process-oriented approach to teaching argue that there is no such stage, but longitudinal studies which might tell us something about the development of writing skills are never cited.

In L2 writing, the decline of the Contrastive Rhetoric Hypothesis and the audio-lingual method together with the changes occurring in L1 writing caused enthusiasm for Kaplan's contrastive rhetoric to wane. If students need to use language meaningfully in speaking, they need to do so just as badly in writing, and the excessive attention paid to form is just as out of place in the ESL composition as it is in a four skills class. Watson (1982) decried the use of models in the ESL writing class, pointing out that typically

analysis and imitation of models leads to flat, boring prose and gives the student the impression that grammaticality is more important than the content of what they write. Taylor (1981) and Zamel (1982) emphasized the similarities between L1 and L2 writing, suggesting that L2 writers, like L1 writers, "use language as a tool to discover and clarify meaning" (Taylor, p.6). They advocated concentrating on the process rather than on the product, emphasizing invention, and assigning writing topics that engaged the student's personality.

Not many studies in L2 composing processes have been performed, but those that have been have employed similar methodologies to research in L1 composing. In general the findings of these studies have been similar to the findings of L1 studies as well.

Zamel's 1983 study found that the composing processes of six advanced ESL students were recursive in nature just like the process noted in L1 studies. Moreover, the same sorts of differences between skilled and unskilled writers were observed. While the skilled writers changed meaning in revising, the least skilled writer made very few such changes. Instead, she paid attention to surface level considerations, allowing these to disrupt the flow of her writing, like the unskilled writers in Perl's study. Jones's study of the composing processes of a monitor overuser and a monitor underuser indicated that while both writers had the same number of grammatical errors in the finished product, the overuser's composition was more disjointed because she had paused so frequently while composing and had concentrated on grammatical details rather than on the whole piece. This study suggests that too much attention to the mechanics of writing is detrimental in L1 and L2 alike. Jones and Tetroe's study (1987) comparing the planning part of the composing processes of subjects writing in both their L1 and L2 found that the subjects used the same planning strategies in their L1 as they did in their L2, but when they were writing in L2, they had trouble completing the planning they were able to complete in L1.

While these similarities have been noted, Raimes (1985) warns against drawing too many parallels between L1 and L2 writing processes prematurely. Given the limited number of studies published, it is difficult to come to any firm conclusions about similarities between L1 and L2 writing processes. But regardless of the specific differences and similarities between the two, there are certain pedagogical implications of the L2 research. For example, if skilled ESL writers attend to meaning before mechanics, teachers

should encourage their unskilled student writers to do likewise so that they may become skilled. Thus, comments on papers that address only the grammatical errors are likely to be counter-productive. Similarly, if better writers revise more and make more substantial revisions, poor students need to learn how to revise more effectively. A course which required students to hand things in once and be graded might, therefore, be less effective than a course requiring multiple drafts, thereby allowing the teacher to work with the student on the revision. Finally, if writing is the process of discovering meaning, we must encourage our students to explore their ideas rather than asking them to indicate models.

While studies of the writing process might imply that certain changes are in order, none of them have provided much insight into the *development* of the writing process. Thus while we may have some idea of what unskilled or inexperienced writers ought to be aiming at, research tell us little about what the most successful ways to get there are, about how skilled writers *become* skilled writers. Thus the studies can do no more than imply. In this way the focus on the process is similar to the focus on the product. On the basis of the difference between what a person knows and what the person needs to know, assumptions are made about how people learn. If one focuses on the product, the difference between the product the learner produces and the product successful writers produce is the basis of certain assumptions; if one looks at the process the difference between how the learner behaves and how successful writers behave is the basis of others. Neither line of research really informs us about what goes on from the time the learner sets out to achieve the goal and the time s/he achieves it—i.e., about learning.

SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE

At the same time that Chomsky's theory of syntax was revolutionizing linguistics, philosophers of language like Austin and Searle were developing Speech Act Theory. The main contention of this theory was that language does not just convey propositional content, it does things. for example, if I say "I will" during my marriage ceremony, I am not only saying something with my utterance, I am doing something (namely, marrying someone). The fact that "I will" has this particular effect is due to the context within which it is uttered and the social conventions which pertain in that context. Speech Act Theories are interested in how language

functions in context, thus they can be said to be interested in the external, conventional aspects of language rather than the internal, psychological aspects of language.

Sociolinguists were also interested in these external aspects of language. Michael Halliday distinguishes between "intra-organism" and "inter-organism" perspectives on the study of language (Halliday, 1978). The former is concerned with language as knowledge, while the latter is concerned with language as social behavior and is the focus of sociolinguists. These different perspectives lead to different areas of investigation. For example, sociolinguists would be interested in pursuing a functional approach to language development rather than a psychological one. Thus the question that would concern them would not be one such as "which morphemes does a child acquire first?" but rather "what are the functions that language serves in the life of the infant?" (Halliday, 1978, p. 18).

The dichotomy might be used to describe categories of critics of traditional approaches to language teaching. Those who focus on the intra-organism, psychological aspects of language might adopt theories such as Krashen's monitor model, while those who focus on the inter-organism, functional aspects of language might adopt the notional-functional approach. Critics of the current-traditional rhetoric in L1 writing have been divided along similar lines. Bizell (1982) distinguishes between "inner-directed theorists" and "outer-directed theorists". The first group is concerned with the "universal, fundamental structures of thought and language" and with pedagogy that facilitates the acquisition of necessary skills. The second group is concerned with "the social processes whereby language learning and thinking capacities are shaped and used by particular communities." Their pedagogy focuses on demystifying these conventions. Those who focus on the writing process belong to the first group. Those who belong to the second group are concerned with the circumstances under which writing comes into being and with how writing is affected by these circumstances. The two groups are not mutually exclusive in any way, but they do represent different vantage points from which to view the problem. The inner-directed perspective was addressed in the previous section of this paper. I will now turn to the outer-directed perspective.

The notional-functional approach and special purpose language teaching look at students' language learning needs in terms of the situations for which the students will need the language. The proponents of these approaches criticize traditional approaches to

language teaching not so much for their methods as for their content. The problem with traditional approaches is that they fail to take into account the pragmatic aspects of communication. The ability to communicate involves more than the knowledge of the structure of the language; one has to know how these structures function in the target language community as well. So primary are the functions that language performs, according to this group, that it is these functions that should determine the language teaching syllabus. Thus when planning a syllabus one should not ask what the student should *know* at the end of this course, but what the student should be able to *do* at the end of this course. The answer should be based on what the student wants or needs to be able to do in the target language.

Research in this area has focused on both language and the learner in different ways from those mentioned earlier. Instead of focusing on the structure of the language, it has focused on how languages allow speakers to perform certain functions. And instead of concentrating on how learners get a second language, it concentrates on what in particular it is that each learner or group of learners is trying to get. Thus, register analyses and the classification of functions make up a large part of the work done in this area.

In L1 composition the outer-directed theorists look at students' needs in a similar way, although perhaps not so exclusively. For example, Mike Rose criticizes traditional remedial writing classes not only for not paying attention to the process of writing, but also for not assigning work that is similar to the work that they will actually have to do in their university classes. He studied 445 essay and take-home examination questions and he found that all called for either exposition or academic argument. None called for writing from personal experience or narrative, which are the most common types of assignment in the traditional remedial writing class. It could thus be argued that these classes do not prepare their students for the *kind of* writing they will be required to do.

In addition to what sorts of assignments students will face in the university and what sorts of skills these tasks will require, one should also consider what sort of discourse is acceptable in a university community. In his article "Inventing the University" Bartholomae argues that adapting to university discourse is one of the most difficult tasks the beginning college writer has to face. The student is required not to find his/her own voice in learning to write, but rather to appropriate (or, put somewhat more cynically, to be

appropriated by) a specialized discourse. Membership in the university community requires a knowledge of the language used by that community. It is not sufficient for the student to write grammatically correct, coherent essays; student writing has to *sound* like academic writing as well.

In the area of L2 writing, Horowitz (1986) criticizes the process-oriented approach to teaching ESL composition¹ for its "almost exclusive emphasis on the psycholinguistic, cognitive, and affective variables". He claims it "has failed to take into account the many forces outside of an individual writers control which define, shape, and ultimately judge a piece of writing" (p. 446). He identifies two main areas for research into the external aspects of academic writing: research on "genre", or the particular discourses of different fields, and research on the kind of assignments students will need to complete during their tenure at the university. It is this second kind of research that Horowitz himself conducted. He collected 54 assignments from 17 departments. What all these assignments had in common was the controlled nature of the task assigned. On the basis of his research, he concludes that "the academic writer's task is not to create personal meaning, but to find, organize, and present data according to fairly explicit instructions (455)."

Research into features of discourse typical of different academic and professional specializations is abundant in the journals devoted to English for Specific Purposes. Examples of such research include Master's study of the use of generic definite article in *Scientific American* (1987) and Swale's work on scholarly introductions (1983). These studies focus on the conventions of specific kinds of discourse. A teacher who knows these conventions, it is argued, can help his/her students conform to them, and such conformity is necessary to the students' success in their chosen profession.

The concern expressed by Rose, Bartholomae, Horowitz and Swales with how topic and audience might affect writing is not antithetical to a concern with the writing process. However, it does seem to contradict the views of some proponents of the process approach. For example, among the implications of teaching process rather than product, Murray includes items like the following: "The text of the writing course is the student's own writing"; "It is the

¹Horowitz does not specify whose recommendations for applying research findings he is criticizing, but from the criticisms he makes, he is probably referring to Zamel, Spack and/or Raimes.

responsibility of the student to explore his own world with his own language,"; and "the process which produces 'creative' and 'functional' writing is the same". Thus we can see that while for Rose and Bartholomae at least part of learning how to write is learning how to conform to conventions imposed by certain audiences and/or tasks, Murray's assumption is that the writing process is an unchanging entity that can be applied to any task.

Most of the process studies cited above involved controlled experiments using college students as subjects. The topics subjects wrote about were mainly general interest topics. The unstated assumption of these studies is the same as Murray's, namely, that there is a writing process which remains the same regardless of external variables. In order to see whether this sort of assumption was a valid one, Selzer (1983) studied the composing processes of an engineer. He found that, unlike the recursive process observed in the other studies, the writing process of this engineer was clearly linear. In addition, although his subject was a skilled writer, he spent very little time revising and the changes he made were mostly superficial. While this study is very limited, it does suggest that writing processes may vary according to the kind of writing being done. Another possible variable is the writer's familiarity with the topic being written about. McCutchen (1986) compared compositions by students who knew about the topic written on with those by students who had less knowledge on the topic and found that the students who were familiar with the topic wrote compositions that were far more cohesive than the compositions of the other group. Witte and Faigely (1983) studied writers and their revisions in a variety of situations and concluded that:

The volume and types of revision changes are dependent upon a number of variables besides the skill of the writer. These variables might be called *external variables* for composing. Included among situational variables are the following: the reason why the text is being written, the format, the medium, the genre, the writer's familiarity with the audience, the projected level of formality, and the length of the task and the projected text. So important are these variables that writing skill might be defined in part as the ability to respond to them (p. 411).

Similar studies in L2 composition have not been performed, but Christine Parkhurst (1988) interviewed native and nonnative scientists who had published in their field to determine if there were differences between the writing processes of these two groups and

between scientists and non-scientists. She found that there were, for example, because scientific topics are predetermined (e.g., writing a report on an experiment), prewriting (invention) activities such as brainstorming are generally unnecessary. She found differences between native and nonnative speakers' processes as well. The nonnative speakers interviewed tended to start with an elaborate plan which they generally stuck to as they went along. They made few revisions between the first and second drafts. Native speakers started with less elaborate plans and relied more on feedback from their colleagues in revising their work. Both groups said that the single most important factor in learning to write scientific discourse was to read widely in their field.

In her article *Different products, Different processes: A Theory About Writing*, Maxine Hairston distinguishes between three "classes" of writing. Class 1 writing consists of brief, everyday sorts of writing: notes, shopping lists, short memos, etc. Class 2 writing she calls "self-limiting" writing. The writer knows what s/he is going to write before the writing is begun. Examples of this kind of writing include research papers, technical papers and lab reports. The third class of writing is what she calls "reflective" writing. It is while doing this sort of writing that a writer discovers meaning as s/he writes. Given the studies cited above, it seems very likely that there are at least three kinds of writing and three kinds of writing processes.

In conclusion, attention to the external situations that affect writing need not be contradictory to attention to the internal aspects of writing. It seems quite evident that both play a role. More research (and more comprehensive research) into the nature of the writing processes of people writing in different settings need to be done. Studies of how audience, topic and specialized discourse affect writing should not be restricted to the written product any more than studies of the writing processes should be restricted to one kind of writing. After all, language is both psychological and social, universal and conventional. We cannot look at half of the picture and expect to see the whole.

CONCLUSION

In this paper I have tried to show how broad concerns about the nature of language and how language can be studied can shed light on research in the areas of L1 composition and L2 acquisition, and

how these two fields in turn influence the study of L2 composition. By standing back from the issues, one is able to gain a broader perspective on them.

The literature reviewed here leads to several conclusions about the research which has thus far been conducted in the area of L2 composition and the related fields of L1 composition and L2 acquisition. First, research in both L1 and L2 composition leaves us with questions about how one actually learns to write. Second, the conclusions reached on the basis of the differences between skilled and unskilled writers concerning what unskilled writers need to do are not self-evident. Finally, language is both social and psychological, and isolating the social from the psychological can only give us an incomplete idea of L2 composition or any other linguistic phenomenon. While the separation of the two might be justified for the purposes of study, it is important that we reunite the two aspects in teaching, since both contribute to our students' success or failure in learning to write.

Future research into L2 writing needs to include longitudinal studies which would give us some insight into how people become good writers. It also needs to examine both the internal and the external variables in writing to give us a more complete idea of how the latter affect the former and vice versa.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write* (pp. 134-165). NY: The Guilford press.
- Bizell, P. (1982). Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. Quoted in Bartholomae, 1985.
- Carell, P. L. (1987). Text as interaction: Some implications of text analysis and reading research for ESL composition. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp.45-55). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Doushaq, M. H. (1986). An investigation into stylistic errors of Arab students learning English for academic purposes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 5, 27-39.

- Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers Inc.
- Edelsky, C. (1982). Writing in a bilingual program: the relation of L1 and L2 texts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 211-228.
- Faigely, L. (1986). Nonacademic writing: The social perspective. In L. Odell & D. Goswami (Eds.), *Writing in Nonacademic Settings*. New York: Guilford.
- Freedman, A., Pringle, I., & Yalden, J. (1983). *Learning to write: First language/second language*. London: Longman.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Khun and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 76-88.
- Hairston, M. (1986). Different products, different processes: A theory about writing. *College composition and Communication*, 37, 442-452.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. Baltimore: University Parks Press.
- Horowitz, D. M. (1986). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 445-462.
- Horowitz, D. M. (1986a). Process, not product: less than meets the eye. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 141-143.
- Jones, S. (1985). Problems with monitor use in second language composing. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write* (96-118). NY: The Guilford Press.
- Jones, S., & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsushashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modeling the production process*(pp. 34-57). NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-50.
- Kaplan, R. (1967). Contrastive rhetoric and the teaching of composition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1, 10-17.
- Kaplan, R. (1968). Contrastive grammar: Teaching composition to the Chinese student. *Journal of English as a second language*, 3, 1-14.
- Kaplan, R. (1976). A further note on contrastive rhetoric. *Communication Quarterly*, 4, 12-19.

- Master, P. (1987). Generic *the* in *Scientific American*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 6, 165-186.
- McCutchen, D. (1986). Domain knowledge and linguistic knowledge in the development of writing ability. *Journal of memory and language*, 25, 431-44.
- Mohan, B., & Lo, W. Au-Yeung (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and development factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19.
- Moragne e Silva, M. (1988). Is the process of composing in a second language similar to composing in the first? *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 1, 16-25.
- Murray, D. (1976). Teaching writing as process, not product. In R. L. Graves (Ed.), *Rhetoric and composition* (pp. 78-82). NJ: Hayden Book Company.
- Odell, L., Cooper, C.R., & Courts, C. (1978). Discourse theory: Implications for research in composing. In L. Odell & C. R. Cooper (Eds.), *Research on Composing: Points of Departure*.
- Parkhurst, C. (1988). Science writing: Content, form, and process differences and teaching implications. Paper presented at the 22nd annual TESOL Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing process of unskilled college writers. *Research in the teaching of English*, 11, 317-336.
- Pianko, S. (1979). A description of the composing process of college freshmen writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 13, 5-22.
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled writers do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 229-258.
- Rose, M. (1980). Remedial writing courses: A critique and a proposal. *College English*, 45, 109-128.
- Saussure, F. (1959). *Course in General Linguistics*. NY: McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Searle, J. (1972). Chomsky's revolution in linguistics. *New York Review of Books*.
- Selzer, J. (1983). The composing processes of an engineer. *College Composition and Communication*, 2.
- Shih, M. (1986). Content-based approaches to teaching academic writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 617-648.
- Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 31, 378-388.

- Spack, R. (1984). Invention strategies and the ESL college composition students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 5-14.
- Swales, J. (1983). Developing materials on scholarly introductions. Cited in Horowitz, 1986.
- Taylor, B. (1981). Content and written form: A two-way street. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 5-13.
- Watson, C. (1982). The use and abuse of models in the ESL writing class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 5-14.
- Witte, S. P., & Faigely, L. (1983). Topical structure and revision: An exploratory study. *College Composition and Communication*, 34, 313-341.
- Young, R. E. (1978). Paradigms and problems: Needed research in rhetorical invention. In C.R. Cooper and I. Odell (Eds.), *Research on composing: point of departure* (pp. 29-50). Urbana, IL: National Council of English Teachers.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 195-209.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing process of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 697-715.

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

TPFLE encourages submission of previously unpublished articles on pedagogical and theoretical issues relating to foreign language education, teaching of English as a foreign/second language, and applied linguistics. Reports of ongoing research are welcome.

Manuscripts should be clearly type/computer written and no more than 30 double-spaced pages in length. Authors should include a separate page with the complete title of the paper and the author's name, address, and phone number. The author's name should not appear elsewhere in the text. Manuscripts printed on the Macintosh system are strongly encouraged.

References and footnotes : In the text, references are cited using the author's last name and publication date. If quotations are cited, these should additionally have page numbers (Wilkins 1976, p. 22). The reference list should be arranged in alphabetical order following the style sheet of *The American Psychological Association*. (The *TESOL Quarterly* uses this format.)

As far as possible, comments and references should be incorporated into the text; footnotes should be set off from the text with a horizontal line.

Tables and graphs: Certain numerical tables can be typed. Other types of material (figures, illustrations, tables involving non-horizontal marks or special symbols) cannot, and must be submitted as camera ready.

The Editors of **TPFLE** reserve the right to make editorial changes in any manuscript accepted for publication.

Manuscripts submitted to **TPFLE** cannot be returned to authors. Submissions will be accepted anytime during the academic year. Please submit two copies of your manuscript to:

Editors, **TPFLE**
Education Building 528
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin TX 78712-1295

***TPFLE* and the FLSC Journal Committee**

TPFLE, published bi-annually by the FLSC Journal Committee, is devoted to the promotion of pedagogical and theoretical issues relating to Foreign Language Education, Teaching of English as a Foreign/Second Language, and Applied Linguistics.

The FLSCJournal Committee, formed in January 1988, consists of faculty and student members from FLSC. The current members of the committee are listed in the inside front cover of this issue. All students, faculty, and graduates of FLSC are eligible for membership in the committee.

Please address all inquiries to:

TPFLE
Education Building 528
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin TX 78712-1295

Individual copies of this journal are available at \$4.50 each.

Make your checks payable to "The University of Texas at Austin."

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 1

Number 4

Fall 1990

FRANKLIN GOZA Language Acquisition Among Southeast Asian
Refugees in the United States

CHENEY CROW Reflection of a Phonologically Mixed Environment in
Early Speech

ROBERT D. MILK Can Foreigners do "Foreigner Talk"? A Study of
the Linguistic Input Provided by Non-Native Teachers of EFL

MARY McGROARTY Input, Interactions, and the Limits of Inference
in Classroom Research: Comments on "Can Foreigners Do
Foreigner Talk?"

BETHYL A. PEARSON Clarification Strategies in the Advisement
Interview

FREDERICK G. HENSEY *on* Peter Newmark's A Textbook of
Translation

DOLORES CARDENAS *on* Judith Lessow-Hurley's The Foundations
of Dual Language Instruction

Foreign Language Education Program

The University of Texas at Austin

**Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education
(TPFLE)**

Editors: Lakshmi Gudipati and Jerry Cline-Bailey

Managing Editor: Elizabeth Mitchell

Faculty Advisors: Elaine Horwitz, Gareth Morgan

TPFLE is the official journal of the Foreign Language Education
Program of The University of Texas at Austin.

Publication of TPFLE has been made possible by a grant from the
RGK Foundation of Austin, Texas.

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 1

Number 4

Fall 1990

Articles

- 244 FRANKLIN GOZA Language Acquisition among Southeast Asian Refugees in the United States
- 260 CHENEY CROW Reflection of a Phonologically Mixed Environment in Early Speech
- 274 ROBERT D. MILK Can Foreigners do "Foreigner Talk"? A Study of the Linguistic Input Provided by Non-Native Teacher of EFL
- 289 MARY McGROARTY Input, Interactions, and the Limits of Inference in Classroom Research: Comments "Can Foreigners do Foreigner Talk"?
- 294 BETHYL A. PEARSON Clarification Strategies in Advisement Interview

Reviews

- 311 FREDERICK G. HENSEY *on* Peter Newmark's A Textbook of Translation
- 319 DOLORES CARDENAS *on* Judith Lessow-Hurley's The Foundations of Dual Language Instruction
-

Foreign Language Education Program

The University of Texas at Austin

Contributors

FRANKLIN GOZA is on the faculty of The Department of Sociology at Bowling Green State University, Ohio.

CHENEY CROW is a doctoral candidate in the Foreign Language Education Program and an instructor of French at The University of Texas at Austin.

ROBERT D. MILK is a professor on the faculty of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences in the Division of Bicultural-Bilingual Studies at The University of Texas at San Antonio. The reaction paper to his article is by MARY MCGROARTY of Northern Arizona University.

BETHYL A. PEARSON is on the faculty of the Department of English at Arizona State University at Tempe.

FREDERICK G. HENSEY is an associate professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at The University of Texas at Austin.

DOLORES CARDENAS is a lecturer in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at The University of Texas at Austin.

Language Acquisition among Southeast Asian Refugees in the United States

FRANKLIN GOZA

Since April 1975 over 900,000 Southeast Asian refugees have relocated to the United States. Although generalizations about this group's linguistic ability abound, systematic studies documenting its English language capabilities and improvement levels are almost nonexistent (see Caplan et al., 1985, for an exception). In an attempt to fill this void, this study examined national level data to determine this population's English proficiency at the time of arrival and again in 1983. Analysis of linguistic ability levels at two different times also permitted the determination of overall language acquisition. This paper will document the English arrival abilities and improvement rates of this entire population and also illustrate the pronounced linguistic heterogeneity found among the various Southeast Asian groups. More specifically, refugee ethnic (e.g., Vietnamese, Chinese, Hmong, Khmer, and Lao) and gender sub-groupings are compared and contrasted as their relative pace of English acquisition is determined. As ethnic and gender differences in linguistic improvement are documented, various aspects of Schumann's social distance (1976) and acculturation (1986) theories are also evaluated to determine their relevance in explaining diverse improvement patterns observed among refugee groups.

Review of Related Literature

Numerous studies have demonstrated that English ability enhances economic and social well-being in the U.S. Research on the economic effects of the English ability not only indicates a positive correlation between English capability and income levels (Grenier, 1984; Cooney and Ortiz, 1983; Tienda and Neidert, 1984), but some experts believe that "English proficiency is essential for success in the U.S. labor market" (Tienda, 1982, P. 460). Within the social realm, the sharing of a common language with the native population increases the possibility of more sophisticated interaction with host society members in ways that generally promote immigrant absorption. Furthermore, speaking the dominant language may enhance employment searches and increase opportunities to relocate to more integrated residential settings which

often provide additional opportunities for social adaptation (Gordon, 1964).

The following discussion begins with a review of several studies examining the importance of English ability on Hispanic social and economic outcomes. This research is relevant to the present discussion because Hispanics constitute the second largest racial/ethnic group in the U.S., and its largest linguistic minority.

Grenier (1984) examined the effect of language on wages among Hispanics, and the effect of language attributes in explaining the wage differential between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. His analyses of the 1976 Survey of Incoming Education indicated that mean hourly wages of Hispanics were significantly below those of non-Hispanics. Specifically, individuals not speaking English well were paid a lower wage than those with more English ability. Grenier suggested that those with a better command of English may be more productive in the workplace, and perhaps merit the higher wage. This suggestion received support as his results indicated little evidence of statistical discrimination. Rather, compositional variables, including English ability, largely accounted for the wage gap. Garcia's (1980) analysis of the same data extended the importance of English ability beyond the economic realm and demonstrated its importance to occupational prestige and educational attainment.

Rather than concentrate on the social and economic consequences of second language acquisition, as sociologists and economists often do, linguists specializing in this area generally examine the processes through which second language ability may be acquired. Schumann's (1976) social distance (SD) hypothesis represents an important contribution to this type of research. The SD theory blends various social factors related to the process of second language acquisition. Social distance is defined as the distance that "pertains to an individual as the member of a social group which is in contact with another social group whose members speak a different language" (Schumann 1976, P.135). Schumann hypothesized that the greater the social distance separating two groups, the more difficult it will be for one group to learn the language of the other.

This theory was decomposed into several observable components: the status of the second language learning (2LL) group vis-à-vis the target language (TL) group; the integration, including enclosure, strategy adopted by the 2LL group; the cohesiveness of the 2LL group; and the congruence of similarity between the cultures

of the 2LL group and the TL group. More specifically, interactions between groups approximately equal in terms of their political and socio-economic status were predicted to result in higher rates of language acquisition than were interactions occurring between highly disparate groups. The integration plan embraced by the 2LL group would determine whether this population opted to eschew its life-style and cultural heritage in favor of that of the host society, maintain its own values, or strive for a compromise situation. It was anticipated that SD would be minimal among groups opting to assimilate, while it would be maximal among those selecting value preservation (Schumann, 1976). Finally, the greater the congruence or degree of similarity between groups, the higher the expected levels of acquisition.

Schumann noted that all of these measures are relative (e.g., cultures A and B are more congruent than cultures A and C) and may not be independent, as they sometimes overlap. More recently, Schumann, (1986) argued that acculturation, which he defined as a cluster variable comprised of certain social and psychological measures, is the most important factor in predicting the amount of language ability acquired by the 2LL group. In the next section, specific research hypotheses of my study are presented which will evaluate several of Schumann's predictions.

Referring specifically to refugee population, few studies have examined the rate of acculturation among refugees in the U.S. In one such study, Caplan et al. (1985) analyzed language acquisition among Vietnamese and Laotian nationals who arrived between October 1978 and March 1982. Results from this study of five locations with large Indochinese refugee populations suggest that while attending ESL classes was responsible for some improvement in English ability, other variables such as duration of U.S. residence, Southeast Asian education, and age at arrival were far stronger predictors.

Methodology

In contrast to the Caplan et al. study (1985), the data used herein are from the National 1983 Annual Survey (ASR). These data contain information on Vietnamese, Laotian, and Kampuchean refugees entering the U.S. from April 1975 to May 1983, which make these results more representative of those experienced by the entire U.S. Indochinese refugee population. This survey was conducted by the office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) of the U.S.

Department of Health and Human Services. Conducted in October 1983, this research sought a representative sample of all Southeast Asian refugees who entered this country between April 1975 and May 1983. To achieve this goal the present survey made use of "the most complete listing[s] of Southeast Asian refugees in the United States" (Bach and Seguin, 1985, P. 16) as no single list of all Southeast Asian refugees in this country existed at that time. The ASR survey construction involved combining two complementary sampling frames. The first was a file of all refugees who registered with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) in January 1980, under the Alien Address Report Program. The INS file accounts for over 80 percent of the refugees entering the United States between 1975 and 1980. The second was, the ORR Master Data File, which consists of a comprehensive list of basic demographic data and addresses for all refugees entering after 1979. Thus when combined, the INS file generated names and addresses for refugees entering this country between April 1975 and December 1979, while ORR master Data File provided respondents for the next four years. Names were selected with a simple random sample from each listing in proportion to the total refugee population. A final sample of 2,500 heads of household were selected. This sample was designed to deliberately compensate for the anticipated difficulty in locating refugees who had moved. Although numerous refugees were not located, comparisons of the basic demographic characteristics of the final ASR sample with the ORR and INS data indicated that the ASR sample was unbiased (Bach and Seguin, 1985). The 1983 ASR data consists of 1, 239 households containing nearly 7,000 individuals. All the subjects were interviewed by a native speaker of the refugees' mother tongue.

Analyses of English improvement included only labor force aged men and women (i.e., those aged 16 to 64) since the ASR data did not contain no linguistic data on those under 16 years of age. English speaking and writing abilities that were determined on the original data, the ASR data, were done with a four level scale ranging from 1 to 4, with the lower value representing the highest proficiency. Appropriate scores were determined with the assistance of the trained interviewers. To avoid any ambiguity in the interpretation of these measures, I have reversed the original scale. In this study, the following scores were assigned for subjects' levels of English ability: 1, no ability; 2, a little ability; 3, good; and 4, fluency. These codes were applied to measures of ability at the time of arrival and to the measures collected in 1983. Because individual

speaking and writing scores were highly correlated, I limit my analytical focus to English speaking ability. This decision was based on the fact that many Southeast Asian refugees, especially the Laotian and Kampuchean nationals, never learned to read nor write their own language. Thus, learning to read and write English, especially as adults, is very difficult for them. For these individuals learning to speak and comprehend English is not only the easiest component of language gain, but this facet of language acquisition is also the most practical as it is needed for the interpersonal interactions that occur numerous times daily. For these reasons this study's emphasis is on improvements in English speaking ability.

To measure improvement in English speaking and writing ability I subtracted the arrival score from the 1983 score. This procedure is problem free until one reaches fluency, at which time further improvement in English ability cannot occur because of the "ceiling effect." To avoid the potential bias of the ceiling effect, those refugees fluent in English at the time of arrival (less than 2 percent of ASR respondents) are excluded from all discussions of English acquisition.

Variables

In the examination of English improvement which follows, I will address several variables that merit discussion because of the importance they may have in the process of language acquisition. The first is sponsor type. Prior to entering the mainstream American way of life, each refugee not financially independent was required to have a sponsor. For a nominal stipend the sponsor agreed to provide social and economic assistance to the refugee(s) under their care. Table 1 demonstrates that during the early years of the resettlement program, sponsors were mainly local church congregations and American families, but that sponsorship roles have increasingly been assumed by earlier cohorts of resettled refugees.

This examination of sponsorship will permit us to address a current debate regarding the differential contributions of the various sponsor types to English acquisition. Some argue that sponsorship by former refugees inhibits progress towards self-sufficiency and other aspects of adaptation, such as English acquisition.

Table 1: Type of Sponsorship by Year of Arrival: All Individuals Aged 16-64, 1983

Sponsor type	1975-1976	1977-1978	1979	1980	1981	1982-1983	Total %
American family	25.1	2.4	6.1	6.7	6.7	5.8	10.3
Congregation	60.1	42.0	47.7	40.2	40.7	42.3	46.1
Nonrelative of same ethnicity	1.2	2.4	3.6	3.1	5.8	3.8	3.4
Other	4.4	11.2	12.2	11.7	12.0	8.9	9.8
Relative	8.7	21.9	29.8	38.0	34.4	38.9	29.0
Unknown	0.5	20.1	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.4	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
[N]	[804]	[169]	[507]	[869]	[781]	[530]	[3660]

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

I anticipated that an American family sponsor would provide the setting most conducive to English improvement; hence, it was hypothesized that this situation would influence language acquisition to a greater positive degree than any other sponsor type because it generally facilitates increased daily interactions with native English speakers. Congregational sponsors were also presumed to be positively related to improvement, but to a lesser degree than American families because congregations frequently sponsored a number of households, making it more difficult for them to meet the personal needs of everyone. Furthermore, the personal interactions occurring between refugees and congregational sponsors are presumed to be more superficial and less frequent than those occurring within American families, thus the expected lower levels of improvement. Other sponsor categories considered include refugee relatives, and non-relatives of the same ethnicity. I hypothesized that these sponsor types will be associated with less English acquisition than American family and congregational sponsors, since English is not generally spoken in Southeast Asian households, while it usually is in the homes of the former sponsor types. A slight reformulation of Schumann's SD theory (1976) permits us to postulate that at the aggregate level those residing with American families or congregational sponsors will experience relatively less SD than refugees residing with other types of

sponsors. Below, I examine improvement rates while controlling for sponsor type in an effort to test the validity of this aspect of the SD hypothesis.

Also examined are regional variables monitoring the area of the country where refugees were initially relocated.¹ California, where over 30 percent of the total Southeast Asian population resided in 1983 (DHHS, 1983), is the area where English improvement is hypothesized to occur at the slowest rate, given the large Asian population residing in that state and the opportunities this presents for interaction without speaking English. Furthermore, in some California counties over 20 percent of the population is Asian, a phenomenon absent elsewhere in the U.S. This type of concentration may well present opportunities to maintain high levels of enclosure (Schumann, 1976) and facilitate the avoidance of English speaking, or conversely the maintenance of non-English languages. Thus, I hypothesized that residence in areas other than California will lead to higher acquisition rates.

The effect of gender on language improvement is also monitored in this study. Men in Southeast Asia generally spend less time at home than women, and consequently more time interacting with the public. I hypothesized that in the U.S., men will continue to have more outside-the-home experiences than women, and that these additional opportunities to interact with non-refugees will lead to greater English acquisition rates. In terms of Schumann's enclosure concept (1976), women refugees are believed to have structural limitations on their abilities to interact with the host population and for this reason were predicted to acquire less English as they experience greater social distance from host society members than do their men counterparts.

A final set of background control variables explored the effect of ethnic origin in language acquisition. The justification for focusing on ethnicity as a background variable is well grounded both theoretically and empirically and need not be repeated here. Accordingly, I hypothesized that the distinctive backgrounds of the various ethnic groups (e.g., the rural and highly illiterate Hmong versus the urban and relatively well educated Vietnamese) will affect

their disposition to improve their English speaking ability. Furthermore, many of the more urbane Vietnamese and Chinese ethnics were familiar with American culture at the time of arrival, an asset I believed would enhance their readiness to improve their English ability. Thus, in terms of SD scale, the ethnic Vietnamese and Chinese who were familiar with American culture (Vietnamese and Chinese ethnic groups) were, in relative terms, were the most congruent group with U.S. society. Accordingly, I hypothesized that aggregate improvement rates will be the highest among Vietnamese and Chinese ethnics (the most westernized groups), and the lowest for the Hmong, Lao, and Khmer.

The last variable that was examined monitored the attendance of any form of U.S. schooling. It is hypothesized that those attending some educational program in this country, regardless of course duration, intensity, or subject matter, will acquire significantly more English ability than their counterparts not participating in similar programs.

Results

Table 2 indicates mean group levels of English proficiency upon arrival and in 1983, with gender and ethnicity controlled. At the time of arrival to the U.S. the mean speaking ability score of all labor force aged individuals was 1.6, rising to 2.5 by 1983. Although aggregate results indicate that improvement was the norm, there were significant differences across gender and ethnic groups reflective of this population's extreme heterogeneity.

At the time of arrival the modal English ability category for all groups, except Vietnamese and Laotian men, was *no* ability. By 1983, most ethnic and gender groups improved such that their modal ability categories were either speaking English *good* or *a little*. For Hmong and other Southeast Asian women (a conglomeration of small ethnic groups), the modal category remained *no* English ability. Table 2 indicates that at the time of

Table 2: English ability of Southeast Asian refugees at arrival and in 1983, by ethnicity and gender: persons aged 16-64

Ethnicity and Gender	Speaking ability at arrival						Speaking ability in 1983						[N]
	None (1)	Little (2)	Good (3)	Fluent (4)	Total	Mean	None (1)	Little (2)	Good (3)	Fluent (4)	Total	Mean	
Chinese													
Men	66.4	26.9	05.6	01.2	100.1	1.4	08.3	38.0	40.3	15.4	100.1	2.6	[431]
Women	71.5	25.5	03.0	00.0	100.0	1.3	16.7	42.0	32.4	08.9	100.0	2.3	[435]
Hmong													
Men	69.0	29.3	01.7	00.0	100.0	1.3	05.2	67.2	06.9	20.7	100.0	2.4	[58]
Women	94.6	05.4	00.0	00.0	100.0	1.0	48.2	39.3	07.1	05.4	100.0	1.6	[56]
Khmer													
Men	48.5	42.3	07.9	01.3	100.0	1.6	15.0	48.5	31.7	04.8	100.0	2.3	[227]
Women	69.2	28.5	02.3	00.0	100.0	1.3	37.6	45.2	16.7	00.4	100.0	1.8	[263]
Lao													
Men	47.3	48.3	03.7	00.7	100.1	1.6	08.7	56.7	30.7	04.0	100.1	2.3	[298]
Women	69.0	30.2	00.8	00.0	100.0	1.3	25.4	52.3	20.3	00.2	100.1	2.0	[255]
Vietnamese													
Men	37.8	38.3	20.3	03.5	99.9	1.9	21.1	24.4	50.1	23.4	99.9	3.0	[851]
Women	48.7	34.1	14.1	03.1	100.0	1.7	07.7	34.2	33.6	21.5	100.0	2.7	[680]
Other S.E. Asian													
Men	63.0	25.9	07.4	03.7	100.0	1.4	11.5	34.6	38.5	15.4	100.0	2.4	[27]
Women	87.0	8.7	04.3	00.0	100.0	1.2	12.5	12.5	37.5	37.5	100.0	1.9	[23]

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

arrival, women of each ethnicity spoke less English than their men counterparts and that this pattern remained unchanged as of 1983. Ethnic differences in both periods were also very pronounced. Vietnamese ethnics, regardless of gender, had the highest proficiency levels both at the time of arrival and in 1983. Hmong men and women arrived with the lowest aggregate English ability levels, but by 1983 the men surpassed the proficiency levels of the Khmer, Lao, and other Southeast Asians. The arrival English ability of ethnic Chinese was relatively low, but improved so much that in 1983 their aggregate ability level was second only to that of Vietnamese.

Table 3: Change in English Proficiency Between Arrival and 1983, by ethnicity and gender: persons aged 16-64

Ethnicity and Gender	Speaking	Writing	[N]
Chinese			
Men	1.2	1.2	[434]
Women	1.0	1.0	[438]
Hmong			
Men	1.1	0.9	[58]
Women	0.6	0.5	[56]
Khmer			
Men	0.7	0.5	[227]
Women	0.5	0.4	[263]
Lao			
Men	0.7	0.5	[300]
Women	0.7	0.4	[256]
Other S.E. Asian			
Men	1.0	0.4	[26]
Women	0.7	0.3	[24]
Vietnamese			
Men	1.1	1.0	[859]
Women	1.1	1.0	[684]

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Table 3 indicates ethnic improvement rates, controlling for gender. Chinese and Vietnamese ethnics were the groups experiencing the greatest improvement, the Khmer and Lao the

least. The results are consistent with all earlier advanced hypotheses, and provide support for the congruence component of Schumann's SD scale. Somewhat of a surprise, however, was the high overall improvement of Hmong men. They spoke almost no English upon arrival, came from a relatively incongruent society, and yet their level of acquisition was as high as that of the Vietnamese and only slightly below the Chinese improvement rate. Gender differences in English improvement levels were minimal among the Vietnamese, Laotians, and Chinese. Among the Hmong and other Southeast Asian ethnics, men showed significantly more improvement than their women counterparts.

Earlier, I suggested that Vietnamese ethnics would improve more than other ethnic groups because of their extended contact with the West, especially, the U.S. The data bolster this hypothesis. These data also support the hypothesis that women acquire English at a slower rate than men--a result consistent with Schumann's enclosure hypothesis. These results also support the hypothesis advanced by Kleinmann and Daniel (1981) that those with little formal education in their native language (e.g., the Lao and Khmer men and women in general) may lack the experience required to formalize linguistic information into understandable patterns.

According to the hypothesis of Kleinmann and Daniel (1981), women refugees were at an immediate disadvantage because they arrived not only with less English ability than men, but also with less formal education (Goza 1987). In addition, because of their cultural background, many Southeast Asian women may continue to spend a great deal of time "enclosed" in their home, perhaps falling into a pattern of isolation, which further restricts opportunities to minimize their SD or enhance their opportunities to learn English.

Table 4 permits a discussion of the hypotheses earlier advanced concerning the effect of sponsor type on English language acquisition. As hypothesized, refugees having American family sponsors demonstrated the most linguistic improvement. There was, however, no significant difference between American family and congregational sponsors concerning the rate of English acquisition. Refugees with a relative, ethnic non-relative, or other

sponsor type (a heterogeneous category of assorted groups) all improved significantly less than the two aforementioned sponsor categories. These results provided further support for Schumann's SD theory as those groups experiencing relatively less SD from the host population showed the greatest levels of improvement. They also support his acculturation argument (1985) in as much as those residing with members of the host society demonstrated the greatest degree of linguistic improvement.

Table 4: Rates of improvement by sponsor type among Southeast Asian refugees aged 16-64 (in percentages)

Rate of Improvement	Congregation	American Family	Relative	Ethnic Non-Relative	Other
-1	0.8	00.5	0.9	02.4	02.6
0	32.4	31.8	35.5	40.5	42.5
1	40.6	40.1	41.9	40.5	44.1
2	19.7	18.4	17.4	14.3	09.2
3	06.5	09.1	4.2	02.4	01.6
Mean rate of improvement	0.97	1.04	0.88	0.74	0.65
Improvement score ranking	2	1	3	4	5
[N]	1709	374	1085	126	379

Source: Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Results presented in Table 5 address the issue of English acquisition by region of residence. Surprisingly, it was in the southern states that refugees demonstrated the greatest improvement. Note, however, that it was in the western states, excluding California, where refugees demonstrated the least improvement. Of the five regions considered, California was number three in terms of overall linguistic improvement, not last as hypothesized. Thus policy makers need not worry that California will become an island of non-English speakers, as language acquisition appears just as likely to occur there as elsewhere in the U.S. Not surprisingly, the

Language Acquisition--SE Asian Refugees/256

rate of English acquisition was much greater among the refugees who participated in some form of U.S. schooling.²

Table 5: Rates of Linguistic Improvement Among Southeast Asian Refugees Aged 16-64, by Initial Region of Resettlement (in Percentages)

Rate of improvement	California	N.East	N.Central	South	West
-1	00.9	01.4	01.3	01.2	00.6
0	34.6	33.4	35.8	30.7	41.1
1	40.7	39.7	39.5	43.2	43.0
2	19.4	20.6	18.0	17.7	10.0
3	04.4	04.9	05.4	07.3	05.3
Mean rate of improvement	0.92	0.94	0.90	0.99	0.78
Improvement score ranking	3	2	4	1	5
[N]	1125	509	701	838	472

Source: Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Results contained in Table 6 indicate that the mean improvement level for those ever attending or currently enrolled in a U.S. school was nearly twice that of individuals who never enrolled in a school program in this country.

Table 6: Rates of improvement by Any of School Attendance Among Southeast Asian Refugees Aged 16-64 (in percentages)

Rate of Improvement	No Schooling in US	Attended US Schools
-1	01.4	00.8
0	42.6	27.1
1	44.8	38.0
2	09.5	25.2
3	01.8	08.8
[N]	1774	1899
Mean Rate of Improvement	00.68	1.14

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

RESULTS

This study documented English language acquisition among Southeast Asian refugees and analyzed the determinants of observed improvements. Results indicate that while linguistic acculturation occurred for all refugee subgroups, for some the pace of this acculturation proceeded at a relatively rapid pace (e.g., the Vietnamese and Chinese). For others (e.g., Lao, Khmer, and women in general), linguistic improvement occurred more slowly and may peak at relatively lower levels. This suggests that special effort must be made to achieve higher enrollment levels among all Lao and Khmer ethnics, as well as most women, in English as a Second language or other U.S. schooling programs. Otherwise, it is likely that the English ability of these subgroups will remain permanently behind that of those refugees currently enjoying a more advantageous position.

American family sponsored refugees did demonstrate the highest rate of English acquisition, although this was not significantly greater than that of those sponsored by congregations. These results suggest that whenever possible, attempts should be made to, at least initially, place refugees with sponsors whose mother tongue is English, as this type of sponsor will promote the acquisition of this language to a greater degree than other sponsor types.

The important effect of schooling on English acquisition was underlined as significantly higher improvement levels were observed among those refugees attending some form of U.S. schooling. Thus a special effort should be made to see that all refugees resettling in this country regardless of their place of origin, be given ample opportunities to study and learn, once they have been resettled.

Finally, Schumann's SD theory received numerous forms of support as various social factors hypothesized to be important to the reduction of social distance, and hence increased language acquisition, were found to be significantly related to English improvement.

REFERENCES

- Bach, R. and R. Sequin. (1985). *Labor Force Participation, Household Composition and Sponsorship among Southeast Asian Refugees*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Caplan, N.J. Whitmore and Q. Bui. (1985). *Southeast Asian Refugee Self-Sufficiency*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Cooney, R. and V. Ortiz. (1983). Nativity, National Origin, and Hispanic Female Participation in the Labor Force. *Social Service Quarterly*, 64, 510-523.
- Department of Health and Human Services. (1983). *Report to Congress: Refugee Resettlement Program*. Washington, D.C.: Social Security Administration, Office of Refugee Resettlement.
- Garcia, S. (1980). Language Usage and the Status Attainment of Chicano Males. *Center for Demography and Ecology Working Paper*, 80-2, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American Life: the Role of Race, religion, And national Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goza, F. (1987). *Adjustment and Adaptation Among Southeast Asian Refugees in the United States*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Grenier, G. (1984). An Analysis of the Effect of language Characteristics on the Wages of the Hispanic-American Males. *Journal of Human Resources*, 19, 35-52.
- Kleinmann, H. and J. Daniel. (1981). Indochinese Resettlement: Language Education and Social Services. *International Migration Review*, 15, 239-245.
- Schumann, J. (1976). Social Distance as a Factor in Second Language Acquisition. *Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7, 379-392.

- Schumann, J. (1986). Research on the Acculturation model for Second Language Acquisition. *Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7, 379-392.
- Tienda, M. (1982). Sex, Ethnicity and Chicano Status Attainment. *International Migration Review*, 16, 435-473.
- Tienda, M. and L. Neidert. (1984). Language, Education and the Socio-economic Achievement of Hispanic Origin Men. *Social Science Quarterly*, 65, 519-536.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An earlier version of this article was presented at the 1988 meetings of the American Association of Applied Linguistics. This research was supported by a contract from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Institute for Research on Poverty. Institutional Support was provided by the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences of Wisconsin-Madison. Computational Support for this study was from a grant to the Center for Demography and Ecology from the Center for Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD-05876).

FOOTNOTES

1. Because over 70% never moved from their original state of residence, this variable also closely reflects current region of residence.
2. Auxiliary tables indicate that 24% men and 25% of women (i.e., aged 16-64) attended ESL classes after arriving in the US. Men's attendance averaged 3.3 hours per week for an average of 10.6 weeks. Women's attendance averaged 3 hours per week for 10.9 weeks.

Reflection of a Phonologically-Mixed Environment in Early Speech

CHENEY CROW

At what point in a child's development does speech production reflect a particular language system? Mehler et al. (1988) have shown that within four days after birth infants can distinguish their language from other languages, although they cannot distinguish between languages not present in their environment. Cross-linguistic perceptual abilities are also evident, and testable, by six months. Werker has shown (1981, Werker and Tees; 1984, Werker; 1988, Werker), that between seven and ten months infants demonstrate the ability to discriminate between sounds which are not phonemically different in their native languages as well as infants of native speakers of the test language. This ability either declines or is not used after twelve months, an age which frequently corresponds both to the onset of speech and the arrest of production of segments which are not part of the phonetic repertoire of the child's target language(s) (Locke, 1980).

Analyses of the babbling production of children in different language environments have been undertaken to determine the point at which speech production reflects the influence of the input languages in the child's environment. Cross-linguistic studies of babbling have found a "positive correlation between the number of children who produce a sound and its occurrence in the world's languages" (Oller and Eilers 1982). Studies by Eadys (1980), Tuaycharoen (1977), Huber (1970), and deBoysson-Bardies (1981), among others, (reviewed in Locke 1983) have searched for evidence in consonant production of differing babbling patterns between different language communities. These studies are part of an increasing body of evidence which illustrates regularity in the order of acquisition of consonants. The emergence of patterns of consonant production in babbling which concur across languages supports the idea that acquisition of consonant production may be primarily determined by the development and the systematic exploration of the vocal tract and articulators (Locke, 1983, Kent, 1979, 1981). Early vowel production may be subject to these same constraints, as described by Buhr (1980); Bickley (1983); and Bond et al. (1982).

In 1988, deBoysson-Bardies undertook the study of formant frequencies of the vowel production of 7-9 month old children in monolingual English, French, Arabic and Cantonese language environments. Extensive analysis showed a clear relationship between the vowel production of the children and that of their input languages. This age range, 7-9 months, correlates well with Kent's (1983) statement that the neurological maturation necessary for voluntary motor control of the articulators begins around six months; vowels generally require less complex movement of the articulators than consonants, which might explain their earlier imitation of the linguistic environment. These findings confirm earlier data of Oller and Eilers (1982) indicating the presence, even during babbling, of speech production characteristics that reflect the ambient language.

Vihman (1985) has shown that there is a continuity between speech production in babbling and in speech. She demonstrates clear parallels between the babbling and emergent speech production in children from 10 to 15 months of age. First words, she claims, can be predicted from the babbling patterns of each child. Such "continuity" illustrates that babbling, because it is directed towards eventual speech targets, reflects the ambient language.

Language Differentiation in Bilingual Children

Language acquisition research on multilingual children has revealed inconsistent and conflicting tendencies in their early speech production, characterized by either separation or integration of the different language systems. Separate, independent phonological systems have been observed in the speech production of some bilingual children whose interlocutors addressed them consistently in only one language (Leopold, 1949; Taeschner, 1978; Vihman, 1985; and others reviewed in Taeschner, 1983 and Hatch, 1978). Overlapping systems resulting in phonological confusion and inconsistency in the speech production of multilingual subjects was reported by De Matteis (1978) and Ruke-Dravina (1965). Vogel, Burling (1973), Chao (1973), Imedadze (1967) and Swain and Wesche (1973), documented consistent, single phonological systems created from a mixture of the languages of bilingual children.

The disparity in the findings among the studies of phonological systems of bilingual children may be attributed to differences in linguistic input to the child. In a multilingual environment, differentiation between phonological systems might be facilitated

for a child by identification of a single linguistic system for each interlocutor. Conversely, the phonological system of a child regularly subjected to language mixing, or switching, in his sociophonetic environment may be characterized by a mixture of elements from the two languages.

Methodology

Over a four-month period, babbling and speech production were analyzed in a multilingual child, Bruno, from the age of 20 to 24 months. In examining the interaction among his languages, emphasis was put on analysis of his vowel production, his choice of lexicon, and the relationship between his babbling and his speech. The emphasis on vowel production was based on evidence presented by deBoysson-Bardies (1989) that imitation of linguistic environment is evident earlier in vowels than in consonant production. Furthermore, the contrasts between French and English vowels may be more easily ascertained than those between the consonants at this stage of development because characteristics that would differentiate French from English consonant production may be confounded by developmental trends in consonant production. The cross-linguistic regularity of consonant acquisition (reviewed in Locke, 1983) is one reason this analysis concentrated on vowel production.

Language Environment: Bruno lived in an environment where three languages were spoken interchangeably by all family members. His mother, Helene, a native speaker of French, spoke Portuguese and English. These languages exhibited strong influence of French vowel, consonant, and stress systems. Bruno's father is a native speaker of Portuguese. Like Helene, his native language was evident in both his second and third languages, English and French. Unlike his parents, who were both late bilinguals, Bruno's 9-year-old brother, Fabio, spoke French, Portuguese and English like a native speaker. In conversation with each other and in addressing Bruno, they all frequently switched languages, even within sentences, so Bruno was exposed to a continual mixture of the three languages. Vowel and stress patterns were produced inconsistently by his parents because of errors and the influence of their native languages on their second and third languages. Therefore, the English which Bruno heard regularly was from three non-native speakers whose vowel, consonant and stress use was uncharacteristic of native-speaker English, which he heard only from Fabio, his brother, and Alexis, his daycare companion.

Duration and Setting of Data-collection: For a four-month period, between the ages of 20 to 24 months, 40-minute bimonthly recordings were made of Bruno's speech, using a Panasonic tape recorder with a Sony ECN-30 electric microphone which was either attached with a clip to Bruno's or the experimenter's clothing, or set on a small microphone stand near his bed. Recordings were made at his home during normal family interaction. Portions of tapes include Bruno's interaction with all family members together, each individual family member, monolingual English speaking children, multilingual family friends, and Bruno alone in his room. Recordings were made in the presence and in the absence of the experimenter.

Method of Transcription: All utterances of the child, both speech and babbling were transcribed phonetically. A reliability check with three other transcribers showed more than 85% agreement on all segments transcribed. For segments on which transcriptions did not concur the transcription of the experimenter was used. Two transcribers were native speakers of English, and the third a native speaker of Italian, who also spoke French. Vowel production in monosyllables and disyllables was analyzed for speech production by a program developed by MacNeilage and Davis, with special additions for inclusion of the French vowels.

Utterances were counted as meaningful words if they appeared at least three times with meaningful intent confirmed by the child's mother, or as babbling. All meaningful words were compared to a phonetic transcription of the target word. Vowels were analyzed for: frequency, correctness, and substitutions in each position of monosyllable and disyllabic words. The vowels analyzed were: i, I, e, ε, æ, a, ā, ɔ, ɔ̃, ʌ, ʌ̃, ə, o, u. Frequency of occurrence was compared to the frequency tables for vowels in French and in English, the dominant languages of Bruno's production during these sessions and general tendencies for frequency, correctness and substitution were assessed. Consonant production and stress assignment were examined and compared across languages, as well within different productions of individual lexical items.

Results

The development of Bruno's lexicon showed a shift from French to English over the four-month period. The lexicon included 24 words at the beginning of the taping sessions, and 98 at the end. The primary language as shown in the lexical choices shifts from a

dominance of French, in the first two sessions, to a balance between French and English in the third session, and finally a predominance of English words, which begins in the fourth session.

Of the 98 items in Bruno's lexicon at the end of the four-month period, several have representations in more than one language. Twenty lexical items occur in both French and English. Thirteen of these 20 pairs have similar representations in both languages. The other 7 are phonologically quite distinct. There are representations in Portuguese and English of two items, one for which the two are similar, agua and water, and one for which they are distinct, chave and key. The single item which has representations in Portuguese and French is quite distinct: mais and encore, meaning 'more'. The two items which appear in all three languages are: nose, nez, nariz, which are differentiated in his production, and elephant, éléphant and elefanchi, which are all produced as the same monosyllable [fɔ].

Vowel Production Frequency

The distribution of vowels in Bruno's lexical targets and the percentages of these vowels in his production, compared to the frequency of these vowels in French (from Delattre) and in English showed a definite dominance of the French vowel system in Bruno's speech production. Bruno's most frequent vowel was [a], a low front vowel in French, and the second most frequent. This vowel comprised 32% of Bruno's vowel production. In English, the low central [a] has a frequency less than .2, and does not appear among the 15 most frequent vowels. Bruno produced the high front vowel [i] in 25% of his vowel production. The high back vowel [o], which occurs in 15% of Bruno's vowel production. Although Bruno rarely produces [e], a high frequency vowel in both French and English, the high percentage of [a] corresponds to the second most frequent vowel in French.

[a] does not occur among the 15 most frequently produced vowels in English. Bruno did not produce the vowel [ɪ], the second most frequent in English, nor did it occur as a target in the first four sessions. In the second set of sessions, it occurred in a few English target words. [æ], the third most frequent vowel in English, occurred neither as a targets nor in production. [ɔ], the fifth most frequent vowel in English, only 16th most common in French, did not occur at all.

Bruno rarely produced a schwa, the most frequent vowel in English, and the fourth most frequent in French, although in the

babbling and early speech of English speaking children (reviewed in MacNeilage and Davis, in preparation), it is the most frequently produced vowel. A similar finding was reported in a study by Oller of Spanish and English speaking children (1982).

Relationship of Production to Target Vowels

The frequency of occurrence of vowels in Bruno's production corresponds closely to their frequency in his choice of target words. [a], the most frequently produced vowel, accounts for 32.8 percent of his production, and 30.9 percent of his target vowels. [i] was second most frequent, as 25.5% of production and 26.5% of targets, followed by [o], in 15.5% of production and 16.7% of targets. All vowel production followed this pattern, with no difference greater than one percent between target and production frequency.

Correctness of Vowels

Analysis of the correct production of vowels was designed to investigate two aspects of vowel production: correctness and substitutions. Each time a vowel was produced correctly, counts were made of whether it was the actual target vowel, or whether it was produced (albeit correctly) as a substitution for another vowel target. [ʌ] was produced most correctly; it was only produced for [ʌ] targets, and was always produced correctly. 78% of production of both [i] and [o] was correct, although [i] was produced for [i] targets only 75% of the time, and [o] for [o] targets only 73% of the time. 76% of [e] production was correct, although [e] was only produced for 41% of [e] target vowels. 66% of [ā] production was correct, yet [ā] was produced for only 54% of [ā] targets. 61% of [u] production was correct, while [u] was the vowel produced for only 42% of [u] targets. 60% of [a] production was correct, and [a] was produced for 54% of [a] target vowels. [æ] was produced correctly 33% of the time, although it was produced for 66% of [æ] targets. Least correctly produced were [ʌ], of which only 13% of production was correct, and for which 23% of [ʌ] targets were produced correctly. [ɪ] was not produced correctly, nor was [ɔ] or [ʒ].

Vowel correctness, examined by word position in mono and disyllabic words showed distinct changes during the sessions. There was a 50% increase in correct vowel production in

monosyllables from the first four to the last three sessions. Correct production of the first vowel in disyllable targets, however, decreased by 50% over the same period, and the second vowel by 40%, due primarily to the increase in non-reduplicated disyllable targets. This is illustrated in Table 1, below, in which designations V1 and V2 represent the first and second vowels of disyllable words, and reduplicated indicates that the two vowels, in fact the first and second syllable, are identical.

Table 1: Overall Percent Correct of All Vowels in Each Syllable Type

Syllable Type	Session 1-4	Session 5-8	All Sessions
Monosyllable	44	69	63
Disyllable V1	89	46	56
Disyllable V2	78	54	61
Reduplicated	32	30	62

Locke (1981) comments that the high vowels are often produced with great accuracy in early speech. In monosyllables, of Bruno's three high frequency vowels, [a], [i], and [o], his most correct vowel was high, [i]. [i] was produced 95% of the time for [i] targets, and 95% of [i] targets were produced correctly. This greatly contrasts with Davis' data from a longitudinal study of vowel production of an English speaker, for whom [i] was "neither called for frequently in V1 production, nor frequently correctly produced when it was called for (38%)" (Davis & MacNeilage, 1988). In Davis' and MacNeilage's English speaker, the most frequent vowel, the schwa, was also the least correctly rendered when it occurred as a target. Bruno's most frequent vowel, [a], was almost the most frequently incorrect. Only 33% of [a] targets were produced as [a], and only 30% of [a] production was for [a] targets, although [a] occurred as a substitute for more than 15% of all vowel targets.

It is interesting to note that in Davis' subject and in Bruno's [a] production the [a] appeared most frequently in labial environments. The large percent correct for [a] in the first vowel of disyllables, 74%, may be due to the high frequency of labial-initial words, which may favor [a] production, since Bruno's most correct [a] production was after labials, and Davis' subject showed a tendency to produce [a] for other targets in labial environments. [a] was less frequently correct in the second syllable of disyllable words: 63% of targets were correctly rendered, and 45% of production was for [a] targets. The first vowel of disyllabic words was least correct for all vowels. This position effect, with the first vowel of disyllable

words the least correct in vowel production, was also found by Davis and MacNeilage. In fact, they considered the position effects, along with error rates, their main findings.

Vowel Substitutions

Bruno used a single vowel [a] to substitute for all other vowels more than 12% of the time. Davis and MacNeilage studied an English-speaking subject, who used a schwa in the same way. They concluded it was being used as a "default" vowel because of its ease of articulation. Bruno's substitutions were not with an open, central vowel. His "default" vowel is [a], a low front, lax vowel. Frequency of use, rather than articulatory ease may have determined which vowels substituted for others the most frequently, since for the English speaking children the schwa was also their most commonly produced vowel in speech.

The most frequent vowels appearing as substitutions were as follows:

1. [a] substitutes more than 12% for all except nasal targets.
Range substitution: 12-57% of other target vowels.
2. [o] substitutes for 6 high front, high back and nasal
Range of substitution: 1-25% of other target vowels.
3. [i] substitutes for 6 high front, low front and mid central
4. [ʌ] substitutes for 5 high front, low front, nasal and high back vowels. Range of substitution: 3-20% of other targets.

Consonant Environment

Labials were most frequent in Bruno's consonant production. Both high and low front vowels occurred frequently in labial environments.: [i] (14%) and [a] (24%) account for 38% of the vowel production in both monosyllable and disyllable words. Mid-central and nasal vowels also occurred primarily in labial environments, while the mid and high back vowels were produced more frequently in alveolar than in labial environments. Davis & MacNeilage's subject favored high back vowels in velar environments, and they suggested this might be a generalized tendency. However, Bruno favored low front vowels in the same environment. Unlike [a] production in an alveolar environment, which may have been due to articulatory constraints of early speech

development, the frequency of low vowels in velar environments may reflect their frequency in linguistic input.

Discussion

Vowel Use Across Sessions: A global approach to the overall tendencies of Bruno's vowel production across all sessions would obscure the cross-linguistic elements in the development of Bruno's speech. The diachronic evolution of his vowel preferences demonstrated what was already apparent in the development of his lexicon; he momentarily abandoned French as his language targets focused on English. In the first four sessions, Bruno's vowel production included frequent use of the front rounded vowels and the nasals characteristic of French. It is important to note that these vowels occurred clearly even in the production of English target words. At the end of the first four sessions, however, and during the second four sessions these vowels occurred much less frequently, even in English targets for which they had previously been produced. During this time the schwa began to occur, although rarely, first in babbling and then in speech. The nasal vowels were absent from his production for two sessions. In fact, in some French words [ʌ] substituted for the front rounded vowel [œ], even though it continued to occur for English targets.

In the first four sessions, French was clearly the dominant vowel system, and the vowels which most clearly differentiate it from English, the front rounded and nasal vowels, occurred with great frequency. Even in Session IV, in which English lexical targets predominated, the French vowel system remained dominant. The French system retreated during the second set of sessions, so the appearance of the English vowels in the English targets might have been interpreted as the emergence of a dual system for the two languages. However, subsequent data, collected five months after the sessions analyzed, has shown a return to the French vowels for both French and English targets, particularly the lack of vowel reduction. Therefore, an "overload" factor, i.e., Bruno's attempt to acquire more complex word structure, introducing more two-word utterances, and possibly concentrating more on English, may have accounted for the lapse of French during the transition phase in the second set of sessions.

Consonants: If the above is the case, it should also be apparent in other aspects of Bruno's speech. The consonant data are difficult to

interpret as evidence of one system or another, since the two most characteristic features of French consonant production, final consonant devoicing and unaspirated initial consonants, occur at this stage in much cross-linguistic acquisition data, as described earlier in this section, and may be accounted for as a developmental phenomenon rather than French dominance in consonant production. For the same reason, it is difficult to isolate as specific to the onset of English the appearance of plosion and aspiration of some initial stop consonants in babbling then occasionally in speech at the end of the first four sessions.

Stress: Stress assignment varies both within and between Bruno's three languages. At the onset of the sessions, stress assignment was correct: even stress in disyllable French words (not the final syllable stress of citation forms); first syllable stress in Portuguese words. No disyllable English targets were attempted in these first sessions. Stress was correctly assigned, by either a rule for each language, or item by item rote learning. In one word, *caro*, stress began to vary in the second session, and continued to alternate between first syllable, second syllable, and even stress throughout the remaining sessions. Bruno's production of the uvular R in the Portuguese also changed as he shifted the stress; when he stressed the second syllable, Bruno produced the uvular R as either an h or a glottal stop. Alone with his father, speaking Portuguese, Bruno used the uvular R and the correct stress. The other variants occurred when he was in French, English, or mixed conversation, the most common in his home.

In the fourth session, the word *baby* was correctly produced with first syllable stress. However, the second vowel was lower and more central than the first, and different from the French production, [bebe]. Davis and MacNeilage interpreted a similar tendency, their subject's frequent use of a schwa in the second syllable of a word with first syllable stress, as evidence of the child's awareness of the unstressed syllable. Such a conclusion cannot be drawn from Bruno's speech.

Bruno appeared to have two distinct, though not completely correct, stress assignment systems after the fourth session. Even stress was produced for French lexical items and uneven stress for Portuguese and English items. Of the three languages, only French was consistently correctly produced, possibly because of the lack of lexical stress. Although Bruno's awareness of variations in stress assignments for Portuguese and English items did not result in

correct stress assignment, variation did occur in Portuguese and English items. They were produced either with the even stress characteristic of running speech in French, or with penultimate stress.

Conclusions: How Separate are the Systems?

It is evident in these data that Bruno's speech production was characterized by dominance of a French vocalic system, despite an intermittent intrusion of English: we see this in his lack of vowel reduction, and the ongoing intrusion of French vowels in his English production after the session in which the English lexicon predominates, and even five months after these sessions. Since his consonant production paralleled general developmental tendencies, it cannot be classified as either a mixed or a dual system. The multiple representations of many lexical items, the variation in stress assignment in non-French words, compared with the consistent production of even stress in French, and the intermittent arrest of his French vowels during the second four sessions indicates Bruno is aware of the existence of multiple systems.

Bruno's speech production does not support either a separate system or a single system hypothesis. In his vowel production, Bruno's use of a default vowel, in this case a French one, was similar to that of Davis' subject, although other features of Bruno's vowel use contrast sharply with those of the vowel use of the English-speaking child. The consonant data is inconclusive, and the stress assignment, although indicative of an awareness of two systems, is not consistent enough to say two systems exist. Although the prosodic system of French is dominant, both segmentally and suprasegmentally Bruno has a mixed system within which some evidence exists of his awareness of their differences, the clearest of which may be the appearance of lexical representations in two, and, in some instances, all three of Bruno's languages.

The sociophonetic environment appears to have had a critical influence on the process of differentiation and separation of Bruno's languages. Bruno's speech reflected the speech in his environment: his parents' speech in their second and third languages is influenced by their native language vowel, stress and consonant production features, so the input Bruno was exposed to is inconsistent because of errors, and different from each speaker. It is not surprising, then, that Bruno's speech between 20 and 24 months contained an

unbalanced mixture of the phonological characteristics of these three languages: the phonological characteristics of his speech were derived from his environment.

It might seem odd, then, that his lexicon does not so accurately mirror his linguistic environment. Despite the multiple representations of certain items, Bruno's choices of language in his lexicon did not show any particular pattern of response either to a language or an interlocutor. The frequency of English was much higher in his speech than it was in his environment. The only apparent reason for the dominance of English in his lexicon after 22 months was that English was the only language system which Bruno heard in isolation. Most children and all of the monolingual speakers in Bruno's environment spoke English. English was also the only language used by all speakers in his environment, and thus might have been identified as "universally" effective for communicating with all interlocutors.

The possibility that the language mixing, stress errors and inter-language vowel influences characteristic of Bruno's speech were idiosyncratic seems slight. Considering his sociophonetic environment, Bruno's phonological mixtures of speech system could have been directly derived from the speech he heard. Bruno's choice of English as a dominant lexicon reflects his awareness that it was the only consistent element in all speakers' lexicons. The variation in the phonological production of all languages by different multilingual and bilingual speakers could only confound the isolation of any one phonological system. Bruno's linguistic input was mixed, and Bruno's speech accurately reflects the mixture. Whether the mixing could be considered a system in itself, since it is his environment, remains to be explored.

References

- Buhr, R.D. (1980). The Emergence of Vowels in an Infant, *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, March, 1980, Vol. 23, No.1., 73-94.
- Bergman, C.R. (1976). Interference vs. Independent Development in Infant Bilingualism, in *Bilingualism in the Bicentennial and Beyond*, ed. by G.Keller (Bilingual, New York).
- Bickley, C. (1983). Acoustic Evidence for Phonological Development of Vowels in Young Children, *Working Papers in Phonetics Vol. IV*, 111-124.

- Bond, Z.S., Petrosino, L., and Dean, C.R. (1982). The emergence of vowels: 17 to 26 months, *Journal of Phonetics*, 10, 417-422.
- Burling, R. (1973). Language development of a Garo and English-speaking child, In C.A. Ferguson & D. I. Slobin (eds) *Studies of Child Language Development*, Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- deBoysson-Bardies, B., Sagart, L., Bacri, N. & Poizat, M. (1981). Phonetic Analysis of late babbling: A case study of a French child. *Journal of Child Language*, 8, 511-524.
- deBoysson-Bardies, B., Sagart, L., & Durand, C. (1984). Discernable differences in the babbling of infants according to target language, *Journal of Child Language*, 11, 1-15.
- Hatch, E.M. (1978). *Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Imedadze, N.V. (1967). On the Psychological nature of child speech formation under conditions of exposure to two languages. *Int. J. Psych.* 2, 129-132.
- Ingram, D. (1976). *Phonological Disability in Children*, New York: Elsevier Press.
- Kent, R.D., (1981). Articulatory-Acoustic perspectives on speech development. R.E. Stark (ed.), *Language Behavior in Infancy and Early Childhood*. North Holland, N.Y: Elsevier
- Kent, R.D. & Murray, A.D. (1983). Acoustic features of infant vocalic utterances at 3, 6, and 9 months., *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 72 (2).
- Leopold, W. (1949). *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child: A Linguist's Record*. Evanston: Northwestern.
- Lindholm, K.J. & Padilla, A.M. (1978). Language Mixing in Bilingual Children, *Journal of Child Language* 5, 327-355.
- Locke, J.L. (1980). Mechanisms of Phonological Development in Children: Maintenance, Learning and Loss. *Proceedings of Chicago LSA*, v. 16.
- Locke, J., (1983). *Phonological Acquisition and Change*, New York: Academic Press.
- Mehler, J., Jusczyk, P., Lambertz, G., Halsted, N., Bertoncini, J., Amiel-Tison, C.(1988). A Precursor of Language Acquisition in Young Infants, *Cognition*, 29.
- Menn, L. (1971). Phonotactic Rules in Beginning Speech, *Lingua* 26, 255-241.
- Menn, L. (1983). Development of Articulatory, Phonetic, and Phonological Capabilities, *Language Production*, Vol. 2, Academic Press, London.

- Moskowitz, A. (1970). The Two-Year-Old Stage in the Acquisition of English Phonology, *Language* 46, 426-441.
- Oller, D.K., & Eilers, R.E. (1982). Similarity of Babbling in Spanish- and English-learning babies, *Journal of Child Language*, 9, 565-577.
- Padilla, A.M, Liebman, S. (1975). Language acquisition in the bilingual child. *Bilingual Rev.* 2, 34-35.
- Ruke-Dravinia, V. (1965). The process of acquisition of apical /r/ and uvular /r/ in the speech of children. *Linguistics* 17, 56-68.
- Swain, M. & Wesche, M. (1975). Linguistic Interaction: Case Study of a Bilingual Child, *Lang. Sci.*, October, 17-22.
- Taeschner, T. (1983). *The Sun is Feminine*: Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Vihman, M. (1982). Formulas in First and Second Language Acquisition, *Exceptional Language and Linguistics*, New York: Academic Press, 261-285.
- Vihman, M., Macken, M., Miller, R. Simmons, H., and Miller, J. (1985). From Babbling to Speech: A Re-Assessment of the Continuity Issue, *Language*, Vol. 61, (2) 397-445.
- Vihman, M. (1985). Language Differentiation by the Bilingual Infant, *Journal of Child Language* 12, 297-324.
- Vogel, I. (1980). One System or Two: An Analysis of a Two-Year-Old Romanian-English Bilingual's Phonology.
- Voltera, V. & Taeschner, T. (1978). The Acquisition and Development of Language by Bilingual Children, *Child Language*, 5, 311-326.
- Werker, J., Gilbert, J., Humphrey, K., and Tees, R. (1981). Developmental Aspects of Cross-Language Speech Perception, *Child Development*, Vol. 52, No. 1, 349-355.
- Werker, J. & Tees, R. (1984). Cross-Language Speech Perception: Evidence for Perceptual Reorganization During the First Year of Life, *Infant Behavior and Development*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 49-63

Can Foreigners Do "Foreigner Talk"?: A Study of the Linguistic Input Provided by Non-Native Teachers of EFL

ROBERT D. MILK

The tendency of native speakers of a language to modify their speech when addressing less-than-proficient non-native speakers has been well established. Previous studies have found this adjustment of linguistic input to occur in the classroom talk of native speakers of English teaching ESL. This study examines a related question: Do proficient *non-native* speakers of English teaching EFL exhibit similar linguistic accommodations when addressing students who are in the process of learning English as have been observed among native ESL teachers? Fourteen Peruvian EFL teachers were tape recorded during 60-90 minutes of classroom interaction with their students. In order to establish the non-native teachers' capacity to produce more complex language than what was produced in the classroom, comparisons were drawn between their levels of syntactic complexity in classroom and interview contexts. In order to determine if the teachers' classroom speech was adjusted to match their listener's level of proficiency, comparisons were drawn among the aggregate data for three broadly defined instructional levels. T-units were used as an index of syntactic complexity. The comparison between classroom and interview samples revealed that the speech addressed to learners in the classroom was significantly less complex than what the teachers were capable of producing in another setting (such as the interview). A comparison between the teachers' classroom speech at the highest and lowest levels of instruction indicated that their speech at the lower level was significantly less complex than at the higher level. The implications of this study, as well as important limitations, are discussed.

The role played by linguistic input in the second language acquisition process has generated a fair amount of discussion in recent years, as researchers seek to identify important variables in this process. For a number of years, this question was not

considered an interesting one by many linguists who, operating from a Chomskyan perspective, rejected the notion that input based on native speakers' performance (which is replete with unsystematic errors) could possibly play an important role in aiding learners acquire competence (i.e., knowledge of the underlying structure of the target language). Research analyzing the speech of native speakers addressing learners (be they young children acquiring the first language or other learners of all ages struggling with a second language) has, however, forced us to re-examine the potential significance of input as a variable in the acquisition process.

Ferguson (1971, 1975) provided important background work for serious consideration of this issue through his identification and description of "simplified registers", which he defined as "more-or-less conventionalized varieties of language used by members of a speech community to address people whose knowledge of the language of the community is felt to be less than normal" (Ferguson & DeBose, 1977, p.100). Possible "real-world" manifestations of this variety include "baby talk" ("the variety of language that is regarded by a speech community as primarily appropriate for addressing young children") and "foreigner talk" ("the variety of language regarded as primarily appropriate for addressing foreigners") (Ferguson & DeBose, 1977, pp.102-103).

Documentation of the phenomena identified by Ferguson has been ample. Studies focusing on "motherese" have found the language used in communicating with young children to be systematically modified in ways that promote communication (Snow, 1977; Snow & Ferguson, 1977; DePaulo & Bonvillian, 1978; Gleason & Weintraub, 1978). In a similar fashion, speech addressed by native speakers towards less-than-proficient non-native speakers exhibits many features that appear to aid comprehension. These defining characteristics for simplified registers have been identified at various levels of language and include such features as clear enunciation, slower rate of speech, more concrete lexicon, and less complex syntactic structures (Hatch, 1983). In addition, certain processes operating in a global fashion across all levels have been identified and described in terms of their potential functional contribution towards enhancing communication. Two examples provided by Ferguson and DeBose (1977) are "simplifying", which by supplying material that is normally omitted and separating elements that are normally fused, serves to add redundancy to the message. Although a functional analysis of "motherese" and "foreigner talk" reveals important differences

(Freed, 1980), the structural similarities between these two registers would seem to suggest that *listener characteristics* can serve at least in some contexts, to *elicit modified language* from native speakers. Whether or not this process is unique to *native* speakers of a language is the primary question motivating this study.

For researchers interested in language teaching, the developing evidence related to the existence of "simplified registers" poses some interesting questions. Do teachers, upon addressing their students in a second or foreign language classroom, systematically modify their speech in a way that makes it more comprehensible? If so, does this "comprehensible input" provided by native teachers in a more or less unconscious manner as a response to the proficiency level of their students, serve an important function in the second language acquisition process (Krashen, 1982)?

Empirical evidence supporting the existence of a simplified register characteristic of foreign language classrooms is provided by Henzl (1974), who defines this register in terms of modified speech as found in foreigner talk and baby talk, combined with elements of "teacher talk" -- i.e., the language that is characteristic of classroom instruction (Cazden, 1979). Further research investigating the hypothesis that teachers' classroom language is adjusted to reflect their learners' level of proficiency was undertaken by Gaies (1977). This study examined syntactic features of the classroom speech of native ESL teachers, finding that their classroom speech was syntactically less complex on a number of variables than their speech out of the classroom. Gaies also compared the teachers' classroom speech at different levels of instruction, and found that "the subjects' classroom language was remarkably fine-tuned to their learners' level of proficiency"; further, Gaies argued that these findings lend "empirical support to the notion that classroom input, like caretaker speech, may facilitate acquisition" (Gaies, 1983, p.207).

The common thread underlying all of the research referred to here is the finding that native speakers appear to intuitively modify their speech when addressing less-than-proficient non-native speakers. The reasons for this common finding across such widely divergent interaction settings are not fully understood, although it might be speculated that the ability to adapt one's level of speech to accommodate the perceived linguistic capabilities of the addressee is part of a native speaker's communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). It is interesting to note that most of the research reported on simplified registers involves native speakers of the target language (a notable exception is Gaies' research study (1977),

which included three non-native ESL teachers in the sample). One interesting question that has not yet been systematically explored is to what extent modifications similar to those found in the speech of native speakers (NS) are also exhibited by proficient non-native speakers (NNS) when addressing less proficient NNS. This question has important practical implications for the teaching of English in areas of the world where, because of the absence of significant numbers of native speakers, most of the teaching is done by NNS of the language. In these areas, the possibility of "acquiring" a second language (following Krashen, 1982) within a classroom context is heavily dependent on the nature of the input provided by the teacher.

The data presented in this study, therefore, address the broad question of whether the tendency to use foreigner talk is unique to native speakers of a language. However, the scope of the study was quite narrow, focusing on only one level of language (syntax), and on only one aspect of syntax (syntactic complexity). In the absence of previous studies examining the linguistic input provided by NNS in teaching situations, it seemed reasonable to narrowly define the scope of the study. Moreover, because a critical intervening variable in studies dealing with the speech of NNS is their level of proficiency in the second language, it was decided that focusing on syntactic complexity would permit a rather straightforward comparison to be made with baseline data gathered outside the classroom. Such a comparison was needed in this study in order to determine if NNS teachers, when interacting with learners in class are modifying the level of syntactic complexity of the input they provide, or if their simplified syntax merely reflected their less-than-native proficiency in the language.

This study, therefore, examined one of the aspects of the linguistic input provided by NNS teaching English in an EFL context. The specific research question addressed was whether non-native teachers of EFL exhibit the same tendency as NS teachers in adjusting their syntactic complexity when addressing learners in the classroom.

Subjects

Fourteen non-native EFL teachers at two major English-teaching centers in Lima, Peru whose native language was Spanish were selected as subjects for this study. Six of the teachers had either lived or travelled in an English-speaking country at some point in

their career. The teachers' English oral language proficiencies were determined by analyzing taped interview data. Subjects' Language Proficiency Interview (LPI) estimates were obtained by asking an official rater for the Texas Language Proficiency Interview System (developed by Educational Testing Service) to rate the teachers' English oral language proficiency, based on taped interview samples. LPI scores ranged from "minimal professional competence" to "near-native" proficiency (see Table 1). Despite occasional lapses in grammar and vocabulary, and varying degrees of mastery of idiomatic English, all of the teachers had a sound mastery of the English syntactic and phonological systems, and possessed a relatively high degree of fluency in the language.

Table 1: LPI Scores for Participating Teachers (N = 14)

Score	Descriptor	Teachers	Number
3	Minimum professional proficiency	E, M	2
3+	Professional proficiency	K	1
4	Distinguished proficiency	A, B, D, G, H, L, N, P	8
4+	Near-native proficiency	C, F, J	3

The students in the centers had all completed secondary school, and typically ranged in age from 18 to 35. A significant number (although not a majority) of the participants were university students, or had completed some university study. Classes at varying instructional levels were selected for participation in the study. Table 2 details the levels for the 14 classes that were tape recorded.

Table 2: Instructional Level of Participating Classrooms (N = 14)

Level	Total Cumulative Hours of English Instruction	Number of Classrooms
Advanced Beginner	90 - 150	6
Low Intermediate	200 - 275	5
High Intermediate	325 - 450	3

Procedures

A regular classroom teaching event of each of the fourteen subjects was tape-recorded. Recordings vary in length from 55-65

minutes, and I was present in the classroom during all recordings as a non-participant observer. In order to allay anxieties, a special effort was made to be visibly present around the center for several weeks prior to initiating the recordings. Both students and teacher understood that I was involved in a research project, and that it was non-evaluative in nature.

Immediately following each classroom recording session, I conducted an informal 15-20 minute taped interview with the teacher. The interviews focused on a number of topics, ranging from personal matters (including hobbies, travel, and family background) to professional topics (for example, curriculum preferences and teaching philosophy). The taped interviews were obtained in order to determine the teachers' English proficiency outside of the classroom setting, as well as to provide baseline data from which to compare the teachers' classroom talk.

Analysis

Transcripts were obtained of both the taped classroom lessons and the teacher interviews. Portions of the transcripts were then submitted to linguistic analysis focusing on the teachers' recorded speech in the two contexts (classroom and interview). Two measures of syntactic complexity were used, both based on the T-unit: (a) mean length of T-units, and (b) ratio of complex ones to all T-units. T-unit is defined here as the "minimal terminable unit", consisting of "one main clause with the subordinate clauses attached to it" (Hunt, 1965, p.20). The usual conventions were followed in calculating "mean length of T-unit": all words in independent clause and related dependent clauses or proportional phrases were counted (O'Donnell et al., 1967; Loban, 1976; Ramirez, 1974; Larsen-Freeman, 1978; McGroarty, 1981). For the second measure, a complex T-unit was defined as containing one or more dependent clauses (McGroarty, 1981). This additional measure was deemed useful because it captures a dimension of syntactic complexity not explicitly present in the first measure.

Although T-unit analysis has been used in both first and second language research as an indicator of syntactic complexity, its use has been questioned on several grounds. Gaies (1980) summarizes some of these criticisms: its failure to take into account "appropriateness"; its failure to discriminate among subjects with a low proficiency when used as an index of second language

development; and, its failure to adjust for distorting factors such as excessive coordination within a sentence.

However, the limitations associated with the T-unit measure noted above relate specifically to its use as an index of second language development (or of "syntactic maturity")--it does not appear to discriminate well among second language speakers at adjacent skill levels (although it does discriminate low and high proficiency levels). Its use in this study is not for the purpose of studying language development, but for the purpose of determining if non-native ESL teachers adjust the complexity of their speech when addressing less-than-proficient learners. The analysis, therefore, is focused not on a comparison among second language speakers at different proficiency levels, but, rather, on a comparison of utterances in different contexts for *the same speakers*. Since a major concern of this study is to determine if the non-native teachers are providing English input that is modified sufficiently for it to be processed by incipient English speakers, then use of a measure which reflects in some way the amount of information that has been incorporated and consolidated "into a single grammatically related unit" (Gaies, 1980, p.58) seemed justified.

The sample of classroom teacher talk chosen for T-unit analysis consisted of the first 50 teacher utterances selected in sequential order from those portions of the lesson involving meaningful student-teacher exchanges (i.e., excluding portions involving drill work, repetitions, or reading). For the purposes of this analysis, utterance was defined as "a meaningful unit of speech, usually bounded by a pause of one second or more" (Cherry, 1978). The sample selected from the interview for analysis consisted of the first 50 utterances occurring once the substantive part of the interview had been initiated (i.e., excluding initial pleasantries and "small talk").

Results

The first question that needs to be addressed is whether or not the teachers' classroom sample represents speech that is less complex than what they are capable of producing in other settings. This is an important question since the subjects in question are non-native speakers of English, and we have no way of knowing whether relatively simple classroom talk might not be due to their less-than-native proficiency in English. In this study, by comparing their classroom sample with the interview sample, it could be

established whether or not they were in fact capable of producing more complex speech than what appeared in the classroom sample. The intention in making this comparison between classroom and interview samples was primarily to establish the ability of the teachers to produce more complex utterances than what they produced in class. However, this comparison should not be used to argue that the teachers are necessarily modifying their speech to accommodate to the learners' needs, since the simplification could be attributed to other factors such as differences in social context between a teaching and an interview setting. If one were to establish whether these non-native teachers were really modifying input to meet learner needs, it would be more appropriate to make comparisons between teacher talk at different levels of instruction (for example, between beginning and advanced levels). This latter comparison, made within the same basic setting (the classroom), eliminates "social context" as a confounding variable in accounting for input simplification.

Table 3: Mean Length of T-unit for Classroom and Interview Samples

Teacher	LPI Level	Classroom	Interview	t-value
A	4	7.06	13.24	6.72***
B	4	5.54	9.22	5.58***
C	4+	7.18	10.58	3.70***
D	4	5.70	9.42	5.10***
E	3	7.28	9.92	3.00**
F	4+	6.16	10.38	4.35***
G	4	6.72	7.98	1.91
H	4	7.70	9.40	2.05*
J	4+	6.70	11.66	6.12***
K	3+	7.26	8.42	1.51
L	4	6.84	7.94	1.72
M	3	7.76	7.59	.20
N	4	7.82	10.46	2.72**
P	4	8.34	10.82	2.85**
Group Mean		7.00	9.79	5.92***
*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 ***p ≤ .001				

The mean length of T-unit for teacher utterances in the two settings (classroom and interview) is reported in Table 3. A two-tailed t-test for two independent samples was conducted in order to determine the level of statistical significance for the difference found

in the speech of these two settings. The results showed clear differences between the teachers' mean length of T-unit in the classroom and interview settings. Thirteen out of the 14 teachers had larger T-unit lengths in their interview samples than in the classrooms. The difference between the group means for the two samples was significant at the .01 level. The differences obtained for classroom vs. interview samples were significant at the .01 level for nine of the teachers. It is interesting to note that two of the instances of nonsignificant differences involved teachers whose LPI score was below 4 (teachers K and M).

Table 4: Complex T-units in Classroom and Interview Settings (N = 14)

Number of Complex T-Units			Ratio of Complex T-Units/All T-Units		
Teacher	Class	Interview	Class	Interview	Ratio of Complex T-Units in Interview vs. Class
A	6	17	.12	.34	2.83
B	1	14	.02	.28	14.00
C	6	22	.12	.44	3.67
D	8	16	.16	.32	2.00
E	11	9	.22	.18	.82
F	6	13	.12	.26	2.17
G	6	2	.12	.04	.33
H	10	19	.20	.38	1.90
J	8	25	.16	.50	3.13
K	13	13	.26	.26	1.00
L	2	6	.04	.12	3.00
M	9	16	.18	.32	1.78
N	12	14	.24	.28	1.17
P	9	19	.18	.38	2.11
Total	107	205			
Mean Ratio			.15*	.29*	1.92
Note: The sample for each setting consists of 50 T-units					
* $p \leq .01$ ($t = 3.63$)					

Table 4 reports the ratio of complex ones to all T-units for utterances in the two settings. The trend is similar to that observed in Table 3, with eleven of the teachers performing a greater number of complex

T-units during the interview. In ten cases, there were at least 50% more complex T-units in the interview sample than in the classroom sample. Having established that the classroom speech of the teachers is simpler than what they are capable of producing in a non-instructional context, the next question is whether they adjust their speech to match the students' proficiency at different instructional levels (i.e., beginner vs. advanced). The ideal way to make this comparison is to examine the data for the *same* teacher at different instructional levels (e.g., Teacher A's speech in a beginning class vs. an advanced class).

Because very few of the teachers who taught beginning classes taught advanced classes, this comparison could not be made, leaving comparison of group means across different instructional levels as the only alternative for addressing this second question. Consequently, in order to determine if differences in syntactic complexity of the classroom input exist as students become more advanced in their instructional level, a comparison was made between the aggregate data for each of the three levels (Table 5). The data for mean length of T-unit by instructional level demonstrate a clear trend in the expected direction, with the samples from the more elementary classrooms showing smaller mean T-unit lengths than the samples from the more advanced classrooms. A one-way Analysis of Variance for the three levels, however, indicated that the differences among them were not significant.

Table 5: Mean Length of T-unit in Classroom Samples by Instructional Level (N = 14)

Level	Number	Average LPI Score	Mean Words/T-Unit
Advanced Beginner (Teachers A-F)	6	4	6.48
Low Intermediate (Teachers G-L)	5	4	7.04
High Intermediate (teachers M-P)	3	4	7.97
F(2,11) = 1.94, n.s.			

In order to determine if the differences obtained between the *highest* and *lowest* instructional levels were statistically significant, a *post hoc* comparison was made between the mean words/T-unit

for the high intermediate classes vs. those for the advanced beginners (Table 6).

Table 6: Mean Length of T-unit of Lowest vs. Highest Instructional Levels (N = 9)

Level	Number	Mean Words/T-Unit
Lowest	6	6.48*
Highest	3	7.97*
* $P \leq .02$, $t = 3.10$		

The differences between these two levels (highest vs. lowest) did prove to be statistically significant ($t = 3.10$, $p \leq .02$). In a similar fashion, aggregate means for the number of complex T-units in the classroom samples (Table 7) show a clear proportionate increase as the instructional level rises (.13 ratio for advanced beginners vs. .20 for high intermediates), although these results are not statistically significant.

Table 7: Complex T-units in Classroom Samples by Instructional Level

Level	N	Number of Complex T-Units	All T-Units	Ratio of Complex/All T-Units
Advanced Beginner	6	38	300	0.13
Low Intermediate	5	39	250	0.16
High Intermediate	3	30	150	0.20

A comparison between the mean number of complex T-units per 50 utterances for the Advanced Beginners (6.33) vs. the High Intermediates (10.00) yielded a t value of 1.78, which is not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Discussion

Previous studies examining teacher talk in second language classrooms suggest that native teachers modify their speech when addressing learners, thus providing linguistic input that presumably might be more easily processed by their students. This study

considered the question of whether non-native teachers of EFL manifest similar linguistic accommodations when addressing their students in the classroom. The data obtained from these classroom and interview contexts clearly suggested that the participating non-native teachers of EFL did modify their speech in a fairly systematic way when addressing students. Moreover, comparisons of input at three different instructional levels suggested that these teachers, as a group, are quite adept at adjusting the complexity of their classroom language to match the processing capabilities of their learners. Because all of the teachers in this study spoke English at a moderate to moderately high level of proficiency, it is not possible to determine whether non-native speakers at lower proficiency levels exhibit similar capabilities in adjusting their speech to accommodate learners' needs, nor is it possible to speculate from this study whether there might be a certain "threshold" level of proficiency in a second language below which appropriate accommodating behavior is not exhibited on a consistent basis. But it does seem possible to argue, based on these data, that proficient non-native teachers of EFL intuitively adjust the complexity of their speech to accommodate the linguistic needs of their students. In a series of books and articles, Krashen (1981, 1982) presented an hypothesis that acquisition of a second language in a classroom setting may depend, in large part, on the student being exposed to large amounts of input at an appropriate level of complexity. Although the connection between an appropriate level of complexity in classroom input and more successful learning outcomes is still in need of further verification, the hypothesis that appropriate linguistic input can be more easily processed by students and can thus facilitate acquisition is an extremely appealing one.

The data presented in this study suggesting that non-native teachers modify the complexity of their speech when addressing learners within the classroom provide reassuring preliminary evidence that they may, despite possessing "accents" and occasional syntactic deviations, be effective "acquisition facilitators", and, thus, potentially effective second language teachers.

There are some important limitations in this study. The design of the study, as originally conceptualized, called for comparisons *for the same teacher* across different instructional levels. Practical considerations imposed by the context in which the data were collected prohibited the implementation of this design. As a result, comparisons across instructional levels had to be made through the means of aggregate data of the teachers at each of the three levels

represented by the participants. This is clearly less than ideal, given individual differences in language use and teaching style, as well as language proficiency. Indeed, it is probably safe to assume that the non-significance of the results obtained in Table 5 is due in part to the high degree of within-group variance generated by differences among individual teachers within each of the instructional levels.

A second limitation of this study is that it examines solely the complexity of the teachers' utterances, and does not consider the specific functions served by the utterances in facilitating the acquisition process (e.g., clarifying, expanding, repeating, etc.). Indeed, this is the limitation shared by all studies that focus on linguistic input without examining "interaction". Long (1981) develops a convincing argument that modifications in interaction offer a more parsimonious explanation for the facilitative role of classroom language in second language acquisition than simply the modification of input. If Long is correct, then future studies of the classroom speech of non-native second language teachers should examine the functions of teacher utterances, particularly *vis a vis* the facilitative effect of modified interaction.

Acknowledgements

The data for this research project were collected while participating as a Senior Lecturer in the Fulbright-Hays Exchange Program in Peru. I wish to thank Marcia Koth de Paredes and Irma Alcazar for their cooperation and assistance in carrying out this project, and to express my indebtedness to the teachers who allowed me to collect data in their classrooms: Carlota Aicardi, Carlos Cuenca, Lucila Ferrand, Violeta Fonseca, Aldo Higashi, Elard Manrique, Luis Ortega, María Quintana, Walter Ramos, Carmen Rohr, Renato Rodríguez, Elisa Velasco, and Carolina Vidal. I would also like to thank Charlene Perez for technical assistance.

References

- Allwright, D. (1983). Classroom-centered research on language teaching and learning: A brief historical overview. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 191-204.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.

- Cazden, C. (1979). Language in education: Variation in the teacher talk register. In J. Alatis & G. Tucker (Eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1979*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Cherry, L. (1978). Teacher-student interaction and teachers' expectations of students' communicative competence. In R. Shuy & M. Griffin (Eds.), *The study of children's functional language and education in the early years*. Final report to the Carnegie Corporation. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Clark, H. & Clark, E. (1977). *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- DePaulo, B. & Bonvillian, J. (1978). The effect on language development of the special characteristics of speech addressed to children. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 7, 189-211.
- Ferguson, C. (1971). Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: A study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk and pidgins. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, C. (1975). Towards a characterization of English foreigner talk. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 17, 1-14.
- Ferguson, C. & C. DeBose. (1977). Simplified register, broken language, and pidginization. In A. Valdman (Ed.), *Pidgins and creoles*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Freed, B. (1980). Talking to foreigners versus talking to children: Similarities and differences. In R. Scarcella & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Research in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gaies, S. (1977). The nature of linguistic input in formal second language learning: Linguistic and communicative strategies in ESL teachers' classroom language. In C. Yorio & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL 77*. Washington: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Gaies, S. (1980). T-Unit analysis in second language research: Applications, problems, and limitations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 53-60.
- Gaies, S. (1983). The investigation of language classroom processes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 205-218.
- Gleason, J. & Weintraub, S. (1978). Input language and the acquisition of communicative competence. In K. Nelson (Ed.), *Children's language*, Vol. 1. New York: Gardner Press.

- Hatch, E. (1983). *Psycholinguistics: A second language perspective..* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Henzl, V. (1974). Linguistic register of foreign language instruction. *Language Learning*, 23, 207-222.
- Hunt, K. (1965). *Grammatical structures written at three grade levels.* NCTE Research Report No. 3. Champaign, IL: National Council for Teachers of English.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1978). An ESL index of development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 12, 439-450.
- Loban, W. (1976). *Language development: Kindergarten through grade twelve.* Urbana, IL: National Council for Teachers of English.
- Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. Paper presented at the New York Academy of Sciences Conference on Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition, New York, January 15-16.
- McGroarty, M. (1981). English language tests, school language use, and achievement in Spanish-speaking high school students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- O'Donnell, R. Griffin, W. & Norris, R. (1967). *Syntax of kindergarten and elementary school children..* Champaign, IL: National Council for Teachers of English.
- O'Donnell, R. (1976). A critique of some indices of syntactic maturity. *Research in the teaching of English*, 10, 31-38.
- Ramirez, A. (1974). The spoken English of Spanish-speaking pupils in a bilingual and monolingual setting: An analysis of syntactic development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Snow, C. (1977). Mothers' speech research: From input to interaction. In C. Snow & C. Ferguson (Eds.), *Talking to children: Language input and acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Snow C. & C. Ferguson (Eds.). (1977). *Talking to children: Language input and acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

***Input, Interactions, and the Limits of Inference
in Classroom Research: Comments on "Can
Foreigners Do Foreigner Talk?"***

MARY MCGROARTY

Robert Milk's study "Can Foreigners Do Foreigner Talk?" extends the input paradigm to a group of speakers, non-native speaker teachers, and a setting, the EFL classroom, too rarely considered in research on language teaching. In so doing, it provides several important findings regarding the linguistic skills of these teachers and also indicates the direction for research needed to confirm the accuracy of the input hypothesis as an explanation of second language learning. The paper is useful in itself because of the new data it provides and additionally useful in its implications for future research on classroom language.

By looking at non-native teachers whose language is the main source of input for their students, the paper supports prior studies of teacher talk which have shown that teachers simplify their speech in various ways when talking to learners. Milk's work shows that teachers used significantly shorter utterances in classes than those used in collegial interviews and that the classroom utterances also tended to be less complex than those used in interviews, although the latter difference was not significant. For these variables, Milk's findings reflect many of the features of teacher talk summarized by Hatch (1983, pp.66 ff.) and suggest that the non-native teachers whose speech was examined are capable of making many of the same kinds of modifications in speech produced by native speakers. (As Milk observes, to establish that learner proficiency level was the factor precipitating modification, it would have been necessary to analyze the same instructor who taught two different levels, but the teaching assignments at the research site precluded such a design.). Nevertheless, by demonstrating that non-native teachers can modify their speech in presumably appropriate directions, Milk's work implies that non-native teachers can produce the simplified input that would serve to enhance learner opportunities to process the second language. Because the foreign language classroom in which both teacher and students are non-native speakers is a common instructional setting around the world, it is reassuring to know that it can potentially provide a positive environment for language acquisition as well as language learning.

However, to be reasonably certain that such teacher modifications do indeed improve learner access to the language taught, we need to link descriptive research such as Milk's study with experimental assessments of the features of input thought to promote acquisition. One way to do this would be to vary the features of input language systematically and test the effects of various types of modifications on learner comprehensions and production. Relevant here is research like that of Chaudron (1983) who studied different types of topic restatements used in lectures and measured consequent learner comprehension. In that study, more and less proficient university-level ESL students performed similarly on recall measures which tapped understanding of synonyms, but the less proficient learners had relatively more difficulty with grammatically complex input (p.448); in other words, for some features of input there was an interaction between learner proficiency level and comprehension. Such research underscores the need to examine a variety of input features and their relationships with learner skills at different levels in order to determine optimal linguistic environments for second language learners. This means looking at length and complexity of teacher utterances, as Milk has done, and in addition, identifying other features of teacher input such as lexical variety and propositional density and assessing the combinations of features best understood by learners at different levels and in various circumstances. By measuring the effects of different sorts of modifications on learner mastery of the language and the interactions between learner level and varieties of modification, we can build a more differentiated model of the linguistic environment best suited to a variety of learners. This model would, in turn, provide guidance for curriculum development and teacher training.

Milk's study as it stands offers powerful support for those interested in insuring that teachers possess a high degree of proficiency in the language they teach. The teachers who participated in his research all demonstrated a "solid basic proficiency" in English, as Milk remarks; most scored in the 4 range and all were rated as at least 3 on the Language Proficiency Interview, an oral rating system based on the Foreign Service Interview (or FSI, now often called Interagency Language Roundtable, or ILR) which includes six levels from 0 to 5 with plus points used to denote scores that approach but do not meet the standards for the subsequent level. The level of skill in the second language shown by these teachers is considerable and well beyond

that demonstrated by the college foreign language majors Carroll studied in the 1960s (Carroll, 1967). Milk's data corroborate some of the current work in language proficiency guidelines which set out Level 3 as the "minimal professional standard" (Liskin-Gasparro, 1984, p.25) needed for many positions involving use of the language. Milk's data suggest that Level 3 is the minimal level needed for teaching a second language; furthermore, there is an indication that attaining Level 4, a level characterized by, among other things, the ability to "tailor speech to the audience" (Lowe, 1980, p.96) might be directly useful for teachers. As Table 1 below shows, two of the three teachers who scored at Level 3 or 3+ did not show significant differences in utterance length between the classroom and the interview samples, while nine of the eleven who scored at Level 4 or 4+ did so. While the difference between these two groups of teachers is not statistically significant (according to Fisher's Exact Test, a test of significance developed to calculate exact probabilities for 2×2 tables with very small expected frequencies per cell), the data clearly challenge those interested in language assessment to operationalize definitions of tailoring speech to audience and test the linguistic strategies identified in terms of their contribution to effective second language teaching.

Table 1: Significant Differences in T-Unit Length Between Classroom and Interview Data

LPI Levels	Yes	No	Total
3, 3+	1	2	3
4, 4+	9	2	11
Total	10	4	14

The data imply that, if features of simplified input can be linked experimentally to improved learner outcomes, it might be helpful to use such information in teacher training. Both researchers in language proficiency assessment and teacher trainers could use this information to help determine what kind of language proficiency is needed to offer instruction in a second language.

The issue of the nature of language proficiency needed to teach a second language also points to the need for greater knowledge of the verbal interaction which takes place in the classroom. As Milk observes, previous work on classroom interaction by Long and

others suggests that it is not only the linguistic structure of input that affects efficiency of instruction; the function of utterances used must also be examined. The model of classroom interaction which we seek must be sensitive to the functions as well as the structures realized in the second language. In this connection, Milk's work points in an important direction hitherto explored only for dyads: the nature of the interaction that occurs when both parties are non-native speakers of the language involved. At present there is some indication that conversation between non-native speakers offers greater and more frequent scope for negotiation of meaning than does conversation between a native and non-native speaker (Gass & Varonis, 1985; Varonis & Gass, 1985). A logical next step is, then, to look at the classroom discourse that takes place between teacher and students when both are non-native speakers. Some of the findings from a series of experimental communication tasks given to pairs of students (Gass & Varonis, 1985, pp.158-160) indicate that, when non-native speakers interact, interlocutors in unidirectional tasks and recipients (rather than givers) of new information use frequent indications of ambiguous input. These findings need to be replicated in the foreign language classroom where the roles of teacher and student and the tasks involved in second language instruction affect the possibilities for communication. In theoretical and practical terms, it would be useful to see whether the negotiation of meaning that goes on when both teacher and students are non-native speakers is different in frequency and kind from that which obtains when the teacher is a native speaker and the students are not.

Studies which elucidate the interactional dimension of input in addition to its linguistic structure in classrooms where all involved are non-native speakers can thus show how different kinds of communications opportunities are shaped. When combined with assessment of the effectiveness of different kinds of opportunities on learner outcomes, such studies can provide valuable information for those who wish to see how the language of the classroom make learning possible. Building on Milk's fine initial efforts, studies of teacher input, relationships between input features, and interactions between non-native teachers and learners can bring us closer to defining that elusive optimum $i + 1$ in the second language classroom. Milk's research suggests some of the ways to move from inference to evidence in studies of classroom language.

References

- Carroll, J. (1967). Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. *Foreign Language Annals*, 1(1), 131-151.
- Chaudron, C. (1983). Simplification of input: Topic reinstatements and their effects on L2 learners' recognition and recall. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(3), 437-458.
- Gass, S. & Varonis, E. (1985). Task variation and non-native/non-native negotiation of meaning. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hatch, E. (1983). Simplified input and second language acquisition. In R. Andersen (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House..
- Liskin-Gasparro, J. (n.d.) The ACTFL proficiency guidelines: A historical perspective. In T. Higgs (Ed.), *Teaching for proficiency, the organizing principle*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Lowe, P. (1980). *Manual for LS oral interview workshops*. Washington: CIA Language School.
- Milk, R. (1985). Can foreigners do foreigner talk? Paper presented at the Colloquium on Classroom-Centered Research, 19th Annual TESOL Convention, New York City, April.
- Varonis, E. & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 71-90.

Clarification Strategies in the Advisement Interview

BETHYL A. PEARSON

This paper marshals evidence for the claim that TESL instruction can benefit by relying more heavily on direct examples of spoken English discourse. It argues that analysis of naturally-occurring conversation can help ESL students, who straddle two linguistic and cultural worlds, increase their communicative proficiency (Taylor, 1988). Using data from natural conversations in a series of intra- and cross-cultural academic advisement interviews conducted with thirty-three students by an American graduate studies director at a major university, this paper shows how clarification question and response patterns of both conversational participants display negotiation strategies that convey not only referential but also important social meaning.

By focusing on clarification question and response patterns in graduate advisement interviews, this study provides models for students to learn how to better respond to the clarification questions posed to them by native speakers (NS) and also how to better confirm their understanding. In addition, the study also alerts the teachers to make their ESL students aware of the fact that confirmation checks in NS speech (the advisor's speech in this study) can also encode a negative challenge that may require special response skills for the non-native speakers (NNS), who may either respond too minimally or come across as too controlling. Finally, this paper encourages TESL instructors to more closely examine these and other question-types in natural conversation in order to equip their ESL students with strategies to better conduct not only crucial institutional encounters, but ordinary conversational exchanges as well.

Review of Relevant Literature

Questions in general have played a central analytic role for sociolinguistic researchers of several types of institutional discourse, including discourse in medical (e.g., West, 1983), legal (e.g., Phillips, 1984), as well as educational (e.g., Mehan, 1979) settings. Typically, two categories of questions characteristic of two speaker roles have been observed: (a) the information questions of the

higher-ranking speaker, (i.e., the doctor, the lawyer, the teacher), which perform the dual functions of eliciting information and controlling the exchange (Goody, 1978), and (b) metalinguistic questions (which comprise clarification and confirmation questions) of the lower-ranking speaker, which are claimed to be one of the few means by which the client participates (Agar, 1985; Shuy, 1983). In addition, Danet (1984) has also shown that higher-ranking speakers can also use clarification questions coercively.

The burgeoning number of analyses of cross-cultural discourse in higher education gatekeeping encounters (e.g., Carpenter, 1983; Fiksdal, 1988; Erickson and Shultz, 1982; Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig, 1988) is indexical of the growing concern for isolating what kinds of linguistic choices in the academic interview process result in either positive or negative social outcomes for the student. A common conclusion of these studies is that NNSs are less successful at achieving positive outcomes than NSs, chiefly because they break the rules of social appropriateness of the target language and culture.

Second language acquisition (SLA) studies have attributed special significance to the second category of questions, i.e., clarification, confirmation, and comprehension questions. They are claimed to be instrumental in making input comprehensible to the learner (Long, 1983a). These questions may be defined as follows. *Confirmation checks*, according to Long and Sato (1983):

involve exact or semantic, complete or partial repetition of the previous speaker's utterance, are encoded as either Yes/No or uninverted (rising intonation) questions (there is a presupposition of a "Yes" answer), and serve either to elicit confirmation that their user had heard and/or understood the previous speaker's previous utterance correctly or to dispel that belief. (275)

An example of such a clarification question strategy from the interview data is a check by the advisor on his understanding of a student's previous utterance, "So you're gonna take the test?"

Comprehension checks are any expressions by an NS designed to establish whether that speaker's preceding utterance has been understood by the interlocutor. An example of such question would be, "You understand that?" *Clarification requests* are any expressions by an NS designed to elicit clarification of the interlocutor's preceding utterance. Clarification requests are most

frequently realized by questions, such as "OK, what is your question now?", but they are also occasionally encoded in statements like "I don't understand," and through imperatives like "Try again" (Long and Sato, 1983, 276).

SLA researchers have studied the significance of these clarification checks, targeting them as interactional adjustments which NS's make in order to provide comprehensible input to NNS's. Although SLA research does not conclusively show the necessity of these and other types of "metalinguistic input" (Schachter, 1986) for language learning, the studies suggest that they are desirable (Long, 1981; 1983a; 1983b). For instance, Pica (1987) has suggested that these question-types be treated as NS triggers for NNS output. Although NNS response modifications to produce target-language like responses were minimal because the NS performed the modification for them in these situations, they can have an indirect effect on the acquisition process. In addition, they have also been studied as the NNSs "restructuring moves" (Pica, 1987, 7) which serve as catalysts for NS assistance (or even other NNS assistance in NNS-NNS conversations (Varonis and Gass, 1985) in understanding linguistic material beyond the L2 repertoire. These moves are believed to facilitate the learner's comprehension and production of the target language (Pica, 1987).

Further, in the occurrence of clarification questions, social considerations intersect with linguistic issues. For instance, Pica, Doughty and Young (1986) and Pica (1987) show that social factors can mitigate against the use of clarification questions however desirable student restructuring moves may be in facilitating SLA. In the asymmetrical power setting of the classroom, they claim, students avoid clarification requests as well as comprehension and confirmation checks because they perceive such strategies as unwelcome challenges to the teacher. In a similar vein, Thomas (1984) argues that what an NNS may intend as a simple metalinguistic comment (e.g., "What do you mean?") can be perceived by the NS as a metapragmatic one, often a challenge.

Thus, while it is true that clarification questions are potentially very important as facilitators of language growth by providing comprehensible language input to the learner (Long, 1983) and in triggering output both from the learner (Pica, 1988) and from the NS (Pica, 1987), it appears that social constraints dictate the patterns of their use. For instance, in advisement interviews, as in other types of institutional discourse, students would be expected to use clarification questions in order to comprehend the advisor's

metalinguistic messages. However, in light of the conclusions of Pica (1987) in the classroom, they might at the same time be conscious of appearing to be too challenging, and resist production of these question-types.

However, Fiksdal (1988, 14) provides some evidence that NS students, relative to NNS, will use more confirmation checks. She mentions that clarification metastatements, i.e., confirmation checks, such as "So what you're saying is . . ." were present in NS responses to the advisor's bad news, but categorically absent in comparable NNS speech. She claims that these checks are crucial in maintaining rapport, and points out that NNS interviews in her study evidenced communication breakdowns without use of confirmation checks.

I drew upon Fiksdal's conclusions, as well as Pica's admonitions, above, in hypothesizing that NSs would use more confirmation checks than NNSs. Contrary to these expectations, however, results show that these checks occurred in NS and NNS speech equivalently, and with successful discourse consequences, despite one major exception noted below.

Similarly, on the part of the advisor in this interactive situation, although information questions would be prevalent in the advisor's speech to both NSs and NNSs, it might be expected that more clarification questions will be used in the interviews with NNSs.

In fact, Carpenter (1983), in her study of intra- and cross-cultural advisement interviews, found that over half of the advisors' questions to NNSs were clarification questions, while less than one-fourth of the questions addressed to NSs comprised these types. Carpenter, in her data base of interviews with twenty-four NSs and four NNSs found that only 22.7 percent of the total number of questions directed to NSs were metalinguistic types, while fully 55.6 percent of questions directed to NNSs belonged to this overall category. She argued that confirmation requests that summarized or repeated previous information accounted for this discrepancy, noting that this sub-type was used on average 4.8 times across all of the NNS interviews, while as many as 11 NS conversations contained none at all, with an average of only .75 instances per conversation.

In light of Carpenter's (1987) findings, I hypothesized that more confirmation checks would occur in speech directed to NNSs than to NSs.

Additionally, unlike the previous studies where clarification questions have been analyzed from only one of the participants' speech corpus (either the advisor or the advisee (see especially

Carpenter, 1983)); my analysis focuses on these questions in the speech of both conversational participants across the total discourse event and identifies the nature of the interlocutor responses to these question-types.

Method

Data for this study was derived from 44 tape-recorded advisement interviews between graduate students and a male university graduate studies director at a major U.S. university. This director is the general gatekeeper for the department. He addresses immediate issues about university policy and course scheduling which have to be handled before the students find departmental, long-term advisors who are connected to their special fields of study.

Only those appointments for which the major purpose was obtaining academic advice about course selection, credits, and related institutional procedure were considered, which eliminated eleven interviews and left 33---26 NNSs and 7 NSs, with the majority of participants being male (4 NNS females; 1 NS female).

The interviews averaged 10 minutes in length. All NNSs had achieved a score of 550 and above on the TOEFL. Both groups of speakers were composed of new and returning graduate students. All interview appointments were initiated by the students, who sought appropriate advice in order to register for the semester.

Criteria of Data Analysis

Questions were first coded into two general categories: information and clarification. Statements were considered questions if they appeared to seek a verbal response, as suggested by a following pause in which the listener was expected to respond. Metalinguistic questions(clarification questions) were sub-categorized into clarification requests (e.g., Ok, what are you asking?), confirmation checks (e.g., You mean you want to take it later?) and comprehension checks (e.g., You understand?).

Data Analysis and Results

Data have been analyzed in two parts, the advisor's clarification strategies and student responses and students' clarification strategies.

The Advisor's clarification strategies

The advisor asked a total of 302 questions. The breakdown of the questions into information - clarification and NS - NNS categories is presented in Table 1.

Table1: Comparison of Numbers of Information Questions and Clarification Questions in the Advisor's Speech in Advisement Interviews

Speaker Type	Information		Clarification		Total
	%	N	%	N	
NNS	73.4	182	26.6	66	248
NS	81.5	44	18.5	10	54

Note: Clarification questions here include comprehension and confirmation checks and clarification requests

Clearly, in both data sets clarification questions are less frequent than information types in the director's speech. In addition, out of the total number of questions directed to NNS's 73.4% were information and 26.6% were clarification types which is only slightly than the ratio of the two question types directed to the NSs. These findings show a marked difference from the findings of Carpenter (1983, 188-9), which showed that fully 55.6% of the advisor's questions to NNSs were clarification, while only 22.7% of these types were addressed to NSs.

Carpenter (1983, 189) claims that the major source of the difference in question usage in the NS versus NNS data is attributable to requests for confirmation. She found many more occurrences of confirmation checks in the advisor's speech in the NNS compared to the NS interviews. She suggests that the difference is attributable to a combination of the following: (a) in NS/NS interviews everything is rightly or wrongly felt to be already understood, (b) requests of this sort can be used to belittle someone or to express disbelief or to coerce someone in legal settings, and are therefore intentionally avoided, especially in NS/NS exchanges, or (c) as a result of the general uncertainty in NS/NNS interactions, confirmation checks were used more in this setting to perform the additional function of pragmatically stalling for time in order to plan what to say next.

However, a detailed comparison of the sub-types of clarification questions in the present study showed that confirmation checks were prevalent not only in speech addressed to NNS's, but to NS's as well. Table 2 illustrates the relevant data.

Table 2: Comparison of Clarification Question Sub-types in the Advisor's Speech in NS vs. NNS Interviews

Question type	NNS		NS	
	%	n	%	n
Confirmation checks	50.0	[33]	80.0	[8]
Clarification requests	27.2	[18]	10.0	[1]
Comprehension checks	22.7	[15]	10.0	[1]

In the NNS data, 50% of the clarification questions were confirmation checks. The remaining half was evenly divided between clarification requests, 27.2%, and comprehension checks, 22.7%. In the NS data, fully 80% of the advisor's clarification questions were confirmation checks, while there was only one clarification request, "So what are you proposing, I'm not sure", and one comprehension check, "You'll pick them up, ok?".

Even on the basis of limited data, it is interesting to speculate why confirmation checks were prevalent in both data sets, rather than merely in language addressed to NNSs. I suggest it is because confirmation checks, unlike the other more direct clarification requests and comprehension checks 2, perform the paired functions of negotiating meaning and maintaining rapport. Varonis and Gass (1985, 82) have pointed out that confirmation checks, or "indicators" of non-understanding, may simultaneously serve the function of "conversational continuant", and that it is not always easy to disambiguate these purposes. I extend the function of "conversational continuant" to the even more social function of maintaining rapport, a potentially important goal in any conversation (see Brown & Levinson, 1978; 1987; Fiksdal, 1988 for details).

For instance, in excerpt 1 given below, the director may very well have understood what the NS student has said, but confirmation check (underlined) is used additionally both to sustain the conversation and to maintain rapport.

1 A: Are we looking at the uh 302 or the 303?

S: The filters course.

A: Filters?

S: Yes, I had a filters course, but I did a D in that.

On the other hand, some of the advisor's confirmation checks functioned in a somewhat coercive manner. Although none were directed to NSs, three different NNS subjects received confirmation checks of coercive type.

In the second excerpt presented below, the professor uses confirmation checks (underlined) to urge the student to rethink the basis for equivalency between courses taken in his native country and those required at the U.S. university. However, the student does not acknowledge the professor's expression of disbelief and comes off at best as non-deferential, and at worst, uncooperative and controlling.

2 S: This is the networks and fields what we had.

A: Networks and field that uh (3.0) that's uh a combination of really two courses. Were you was that a half year or a full year? I'm not sure how you how at your school you divided these up.

S: This was a half year.

A: Half year? (2.0) OK, I can see the networks part.

S: / /we've got two semesters and two semesters we've got five subjects and everything. And we've got a semester examination at the end of the semester. This is the way we proceed.

A: OK, well this is very similar, so this is one semester, though?

S: Right. This is a one-semester subject.

A: For one semester? Half a year?

S: Mm-hmm.

A: This is amazing because of the wide range of materials here. You see what you've done here in one semester, we have one semester of electrical networks, another semester of the fields and uh it's just difficult to conceive that you went into depth in all of these in all of these subjects.

S: We've done everything.

This and other student response patterns suggest areas where ESL learners need communicative work. For example, NS students typically respond to confirmation checks not only with agreement but with some repetition and/or expansion of the advisor's utterance as can be seen in excerpt 3. Repetition, it has been noted, may enhance solidarity (Brown and Levinson, 1978; 1987).

3 A: And just the fundamentals of the materials themselves. You said no, you haven't had that?

NS: No. I haven't had these; it's been mentioned, but never studied.

However, NNS's usually provide only minimal affirmative responses, sometimes eliciting further clarification requests from the advisor as shown in excerpt 4 and sometimes making themselves appear less cooperative as shown in excerpts 4 and 5:

4 NNS: I just went to the language center and they said asked me to come next semester.

A : Oh, for the test?

NNS: Yeah. (2.0)

A : So you're gonna take the test?

NNS: Yeah.

5 NNS: I think I major in the semi-conductor, solid-state.

A : Solid state?

NNS: Yes.

As mentioned, Pica's (1988) study with low-level proficiency NNS's revealed that in response to the NS's requests for clarification, confirmation or repetition, the learners only minimally modified their output because the NS performed the modification for them. However, the data in the interviews here with highly proficient speakers suggest that the NS (the advisor) often encourages student responses. He paused after calling for clarification (as in excerpt 2 above) and he also often allowed both NSs and NNSs to at least attempt to restate their utterance, especially when his clarification request seemed to be triggered by a student's own sense of difficulty or even embarrassment in presenting an uncomfortable topic, as in excerpt 6:

6 NNS: In the first semester you said that I could take a grading job with Dr. xxx. After that second semester you had given me a nomination for the graduate uh out-of-state tuition waiver because I had quite a good GPA because my father had expired in the second semester, so I had gone home. So uh after that tuition that means this is my first semester I have completed most of the course work now but in the January semester I really want to do some computer courses. That is just for one semester, but because I have completed

all the electrical courses so I don't have anything to take in spring semester, so but if I register for more than 6 credits I have to pay the out-of-state tuition, so I cannot take those courses, so if it's possible I think my GPA has gone down because of last semester.

A : Yes, ok. Now, what is it that you want? I'm not sure.

NNS: Uh if it is possible for you can you give a nomination for just one semester this spring so I can complete two courses which I want to take in computer science?

A : OK, for the uh out-of-state tuition waiver?

NNS: Yes, yes.

To summarize, the data presented above clearly show that although the majority of the advisor's questions across both interview sets are information questions, clarification questions are also present in both sets, and more of the clarification checks occur in the speech he directs to NNSs. However, when the questions were sub-categorized, it was found that confirmation checks occurred more often in speech he directed to NSs; probably because these checks, unlike other metalinguistic questions, often encode rapport, and rapport was seen to be more salient in NS-NS exchanges than in NS-NNS exchanges. In addition, the advisor's confirmation checks sometimes also encoded a challenge which was ignored by the NNS whose responses appeared to be overly controlling the conversation, as shown above.

The Students' Clarification Strategies

The findings presented in Table 3 demonstrate that both NSs and NNSs used similar types of questions to approximately the same extent. Information types were a majority in both cases. Unlike the subjects studied by Fiksdal (1988) who did not use "metastatements", the NNSs in this study did use confirmation "metastatements," although NSs used a slightly higher percentage than NNSs.

As Table 3 shows, although a majority of the total 267 questions asked by students across both interview sets were information questions, clarification types did occur in similar percentages in both sets. Note that confirmation checks were the only type of clarification question in the student data.

Table 3: Comparison of numbers of information questions and clarification questions in the students' speech in advisement interviews.

Speaker Type	Information		Clarification		Total
	%	N	%	N	
NNS	56	42	44	33	75
NS	63	121	37	71	192
Note: Clarification questions here include only confirmation checks					

There were no comprehension checks or clarification requests, probably because such questions are more direct, and comprehension checks, "You understand that?", imply an unacceptable power discrepancy of student/speaker over advisor/listener. Clarification requests, "Would you say that again?" still overtly demand extra conversational work. It is not surprising that the students did not want to be seen as challenging the director by using these more powerful and demanding types (Pica 1987; Thomas 1983). In contrast, confirmation checks are more acceptably indirect and polite, and therefore, perhaps a better strategy, socially speaking, for obtaining clarification.

As in the advisor's speech, the students' checks, both NS and NNS, overwhelmingly confirmed their already correct deductions. It therefore seems that the purpose of these checks is as much to sustain rapport as to obtain clarification. This claim can be supported by the fact that most confirmation checks were received with affirmative responses by the director, although in a few cases, (5 in the NNS data and 2 in the NS set), there was some additional qualification of the agreement. Only 8 out of 71 confirmation checks in the NNS data and 3 out of 33 in the NS data met with the director's disagreement. Therefore, only a minority of these checks counted as pure strategies for obtaining clarification. It should also be noted that, beyond purposes of clarification and rapport, these checks may simply provide students an allowable stalling time during which the advisor's explanations can be reprocessed or the contents of the next utterance can be planned. How or whether this opportunity for reprocessing aids in the negotiation of comprehended input for the NNS (Gass, 1988) remains to be tested formally, however.

The NNSs of this study seemed to be as adept at using these checks as the NSs, as shown in their encoding of the questions in linguistic choices which display surface similarity with those of the

NS. The majority of these confirmation questions for both groups began with conventional (and therefore, teachable) lexical items such as "so", "you mean", "well", "then", "that means", "in other words", and so on. Example 8 illustrates these uniform confirmation checks under the three categories of advisor response: (a) agreement, (b) disagreement, and (c) partial agreement and expansion.

- 8 (a) Advisor agreement:
NNS: So according to them I'm OK, then, right?
A : Yes, that's right.
 (b) Advisor disagreement:
NS : So I only need 18 more credits if I stay with the MS?
A : Well, no let's see I guess we figured we needed three more because one of these wouldn't count. See, you've got 19.
 (c) Advisor partial agreement and expansion:
NNS: So it's the right distribution you're checking on.
A : That's right. Then when you start taking those classes (etc.)

While both NSs and NNSs used confirmation checks in similar ways, in at least one instance the absence of this metalanguage in the speech of one NNS caused extra conversational work for the advisor. This finding is in accordance with Fiksdal (1988), who argued that in instances where NNSs did not use a confirmation check as acknowledgement of understanding the advisor's bad news, the advisor continued to re-explain the bad news throughout the rest of the interview.

As shown in example 9, the absence of a confirmation check caused prolonged discourse consequences. The advisor had instructed the NNS, in four separate instances throughout this interview, (turns 1, 3, 5, and 8) to choose a long-term advisor in the student's particular field. Only at the point at which a confirmation check was issued (turn 8) did he stop seeking confirmation of the student's understanding of his directive.

- 9 1 A: So it's up to you to pick one of those as an advisor.
 2 S: Mm-hmm.
 [other conversation]. . .
 3 A: So you choose a professor in your specialty area, go see them and ask if they will be your advisor.

4 S: Yes.

[other conversation]. . .

5 A: So to get in the rest of the program find an advisor to help you.

6 S: Mm-hmm.

[other conversation]. . .

7 A: Ok, I really encourage you to find an advisor.

8 S: So, mm, we'd better we'd better meet some advisor?

9 A: Yes, that would be a good idea.

Conclusion

This paper has compared the production of and response to clarification questions in NS-NS and NS-NNS graduate advisement interviews. Analysis of the data has shown that clarification questions, which occur in both sets of interviews, pattern differently in the two data groups. The advisor used more clarification requests and comprehension checks to NNSs than to NSs, but he used more confirmation checks to NSs. Only NNS students received rather coercive types of confirmation checks and their response to this coercion is often problematic.

Both NS and NNS student groups issue confirmation checks to an equivalent degree, but with potentially differently weighted functions. That is, these questions may represent requests for clarification more for NNSs than for NSs and rapport more for NSs than for NNSs.

In teaching the function of these checks, it seems that ESL professionals should highlight the importance of mutual displays of solidarity and rapport by both conversational participants. At the same time, they must also let students know that confirmation checks may not be the most effective means of obtaining clarification because they may be misinterpreted as mere "conversational continuants" (Varonis and Gass, 1985) or signals of agreement.

Using authentic data as language models, however, may help teachers to minimize this risk of misinterpretation (especially if the data is collected by the students themselves). Instructors can present interesting examples of different functions of these question-types, whether challenging, rapport-sustaining or requesting clarification. They can also illustrate response forms of restatement and expansion, distinguishing the occasions that allow minimal responses from those that require more interactional work for one or both conversational participants. Techniques which NSs use can be

compared to those of high-level proficiency NNSs, and lower-level students can be taught how to practice and refine these strategies for their own use. Students can discuss, interpret, and experiment with these new patterns of discourse in their everyday conversational exchanges. In short, systematic cultural variations can be catalysts for discussion and learning, too.

Finally, with Thomas (1983) I suggest that TESL instructors need to seek explicit ways of teaching discourse norms in order to help students learn communicative strategies to better sustain conversation and avoid communicative failure. I hope that this analysis of communicative norms through interpretations of and responses to questions in the advisement setting will go some way toward this end.

Acknowledgements

A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 1988 Annual Rocky Mountain Regional TESOL Convention in Salt Lake City, Utah. I deeply appreciate the contribution of those consenting participants in this study who without hesitation allowed themselves to be observed and tape-recorded during the advising sessions.

References

- Agar, M. (1985). Institutional discourse. *Text*, 5, 147-168.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Hartford, B. (1988). Congruence and status: A comparative study of status switching in native and non-native speech acts. Paper presented at Pragmatics and Language Learning, Champaign, IL.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena in E. Goody (Eds.). *Questions and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. & Levinson S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carpenter, C. 1983. 'Foreigner talk' in university office-hour appointments in N.Wolfson and E.Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Chun, A., Day, R., Chenoweth, N.A., & Luppescu, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and correction: A study of native-nonnative conversations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 537-547.
- Danet, B. (1984). Studies of legal discourse. *Text*, 4, 143-172.

- Day, R., Chenoweth, N.A., Chun, A. & Luppescu, S. (1984). Corrective feedback in native-nonnative discourse. *Language Learning*, 34, 19-45.
- Erickson, F. & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fiksdal, S. (1988). Verbal and non-verbal strategies of rapport. *Linguistics and Education*, 1, 3-17.
- Gass, S. (1988). Integrating research areas: A framework for second language studies. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 198-217.
- Goody, E. (Ed.). (1978). *Questions and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition in H. Winitz (ed.). *Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, 259-78.
- Long, M. (1983a). Native speaker/Non-native speaker conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.
- Long, M. (1983b). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 177-195.
- Long, M. & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. Seliger and M. Long (Eds.). *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: The social organization of classroom behavior*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Owsley, H. & Myers-Scotton, C. (1984). The conversational expression of power by television interviewers. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 123, 261-271.
- Philips, S. (1984). The social organizations of questions and answers in courtroom discourse: A study of changes of plea in an Arizona Court. *Text*, 4, 225-248.
- Pica, T. (1987). Second-language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 3-21.
- Pica, T. (1988). Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome on NS-NNS negotiated interaction. *Language Learning*, 38, 45-73.
- Pica, T., C. Doughty, & Young, R. (1986). Making input comprehensible: Do interactional modifications help? *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 72, 1-25.
- Schachter, J. (1986). Three approaches to the study of input. *Language Learning*, 36, 211-225.

- Shuy, R. (1983). Three types of interference to an effective exchange of information in the medical interview. In S. Fisher & A. Todd (Eds.). *The social organization of doctor-patient communication*. WA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Taylor, D. (1988). The meaning of the term competence in linguistics and applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 148-167.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91-112.
- Thomas, J. (1984). Cross-cultural discourse as 'unequal encounter': Towards a pragmatic analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 226-235.
- Varonis, E. & S. Gass, S. (1985). Nonnative/nonnative conversations: a model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 71-90.
- West, C. (1983). 'Ask me no questions. . .': An analysis of queries and responses in physician-patient dialogues in S. Fisher & A.D. Todd (Eds.). *The social organization of doctor-patient communication*. WA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Transcription conventions

xxx nouns omitted to preserve anonymity
/ / words were unclear to transcriber
... short pause
/ interruption
CAPS emphasis

Notes

1. Long (1983a) distinguishes between strategies, which native speakers use to avoid conversational trouble (including comprehension checks) and tactics, which repair discourse when trouble occurs (including confirmation checks and clarification requests). In this paper, I avoid this distinction, using strategies in a general sense.
2. Explicit corrections by the advisor, a very direct source of metalinguistic input, were virtually absent, very unlike the findings of Day, Chenoweth, Chun, & Luppescu (1984) in peer-to-peer conversations. In the present study, out of 70 errors in the NNS speech, only 8 were corrected, or 11%. Furthermore, all of the corrected errors were factual errors. The remaining 60 errors,

excluding pronunciation errors, were composed of 27 errors in word choice, 20 syntactic errors and 12 omissions of words required by rules of standard English grammar, according to the categories of Chun, Day, Chenoweth and Luppescu (1982). So, students made very few errors and the ones they did make went virtually uncorrected unless the error concerned the truth value of an utterance.

A Textbook of Translation

Peter Newmark. Hemel Hempstead, England: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd., 1988.

Peter Newmark's (1988) *A Textbook of Translation* is addressed mainly to British university students of translation with a degree-level reading competence in a given foreign language, most likely German or French. The author's choice of topics and examples further suggests that many of the intended readers are concerned with some specialized field of knowledge, such as medicine or political science. These overall tendencies may limit but certainly do not negate the book's potential interest for students of languages other than the above and for literary translation.

Over the past several years, the annual meetings of the American Translators' Association have included a growing number of sections on translation teaching. The 1987 meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese included a one-day workshop on the teaching of translation. There is a growing awareness of the relevance of translation theory and translation teaching for the broader field of second-language instruction; for a recent overview, see Krawutschke's (1989) *Translator and interpreter training and foreign language pedagogy*.

Overall, Newmark's text is divided into "Principles" and "Methods" sections. The first part, constituting the bulk of the work, expounds the author's approach to the text and discusses ways to solve concrete translation problems. The second and much smaller section consists of commented translations to sample texts. Newmark's stated intention is to provide students a course in translation principles and methodology, but he strives to downplay theory. He argues that theory is pointless unless it arises from translation practice. Theory pays its way, so to speak, if it identifies and defines translation problems, indicates what factors are involved in the solution, and produces the most suitable translation procedure along with the resultant translation (p. 9).

"Principles" covers 20 chapters, which may be organized as follows:

- a. Textual considerations
- b. Methods of translation
- c. General problems in translation
- d. Applications of linguistic models
- e. Solutions to specific problems
- f. Revision and criticism

For Newmark, the translator's obvious point of departure is the source text. A simplistic view of translation might suppose that what follows is a straight path to the target text, guided by a particular set of principles to be implemented by a particular set of techniques. In practice, the translator is obliged to cope with tensions that pull in different directions: toward or away from the source language and its culture, the author and the reader, the translator and the two texts.

The process of translation begins with a determination of text function. Here, Newmark makes use of a tripartite model of communicative functions:

- a. the **expressive** function, centered on the author and accounting for serious literature, authoritative statements, and other texts which Newmark subsumes under the term "sacred texts".
- b. the **informative** or **referential** function, centered on external realities, which covers textbooks, reports, articles, and the like dealing with scientific, technological, commercial, industrial, and economic topics; Newmark calls such texts "informative".
- c. the **vocative** function, aimed at the readership and intended to provoke some sort of reaction. This function is embodied in notices, ads, popular fiction, propaganda, and instructions, all grouped by Newmark under the heading "anonymous texts".

The point of this classification is to help determine where the translator's emphasis should lie, whether on the source language or on the target language. Each text type has certain characteristics and lends itself to one of two methods or general approaches to translation, the semantic and the communicative. Semantic translation is geared to the source language, includes relatively "literal" treatments, and is considered particularly appropriate for expressive texts. Communicative translation is geared to the target language, includes relatively "free" treatments, and is recommended for informative and anonymous texts.

Stated otherwise, Newmark would recommend that the translator of the work of a well known author or of a major political address be as faithful to the author's precise contextual meaning as

the norms of the target language allow. While this is not meant to mean a dogmatically "literal" treatment, Newmark makes it clear that he favors a fairly conservative treatment of the original. At times he takes up cudgels against the prevailing anti-literalist trend among such contemporary theorists as Vinay & Darbelnet (1977) and Seleskovitch & Lederer (1986) (Ch. 7, *passim*).

The communicative approach, in Newmark's works, "attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership" (p.47). To achieve this with an informative text (such as a book review or an instructional manual) or an anonymous text (such as a public health notice or a radio script), the translator has a greater leeway in solving problems involving culture, style, and medium. Semantic translation attempts to be faithful to the author's intent and style, insofar as the target language permits. A semantic treatment is not rigidly "literal" but "admits the creative exception to 100% fidelity and allows for the translator's empathy with the original" (p.46).

Both source and target texts must be dealt with at various *levels*: their linguistic structure, their content and purpose, their mood and cohesion, and their degree of naturalness and appropriateness. Texts are segmented into units of thoughts and thence into units of translation. For Newmark, the primary unit is the sentence, and the translator should first look at the thematic structure. The next smaller unit is the clause, and within the clause cohesive patterns or collocations. At the lowest level we find the lexical unit and its multiple meanings: physical, figurative, technical, colloquial. Context will often, but not always, clarify the *type of meaning* involved.

A large part of this first section is taken up with procedures for solving translation problems. Semantic and communicative *methods* apply to texts as wholes, whereas *procedures* relate to sentences and other subsets of texts. In contrast to the amount of attention given to techniques and procedures by some other scholars, Newmark is quite sparse in his treatment of the mechanics of the procedures he identifies. He provides a short overview of several "literal" procedures and an even briefer mention of procedures proposed by the comparative-stylistics school such as modulation and compensation. There is a somewhat fuller discussion of two procedures that Newmark finds useful: *transference* (loanwords and transcriptions) and *transposition* (grammatical shifts).

While Newmark denies the relevance for the translator of either structuralist or generative grammars . . . the former because of their failure to deal with meaning, the latter because of their focus on *langue* rather *parole* (p.125-126) . . . he does find some value in case grammar and in componential analysis. He looks to case grammar to fill those gaps in surface structure that the translator may need to fill by determining what case roles are played by some of the actants of a sentence.

There is seldom full synonymy of words across languages. Newmark (following Nida 1975) finds componential analysis a valuable tool for identifying the semantic limit of source language terms. Componential analysis is presented through various graphic displays, such as matrix and scalar diagrams. The rest of the methodological section addresses specific problems of translation and recommends solutions based on the foregoing principles and using one or another of the procedures. The two most detailed treatments (a chapter each) are culture-based terms and metaphors. Other translation problems addressed include neologisms, puns, dialect, acronyms, eponyms, and several major literary genres. One chapter is devoted to translation criticism, and the section ends with detailed suggestions for revision of draft translations by students in examinations.

Part II consists of 13 sample texts accompanied by translation and commentary. In a few cases, both a communicative and a semantic version are provided. As an example, consider the following excerpt:

Original:

cette resurgence du manicheisme, ce 'retour du sacré' sont-ils destinés à compenser la frustration de certains qui avaient été invités par le premier secrétaire à se tenir tranquilles pendant l'élection présidentielle?

Semantic version, appropriate if this is an authoritative text, such as a party secretary's speech:

This resurgence Manichaeism, this 'return of the sacred' -- is this intended to compensate for the frustration of some individuals who had been invited by the first secretary to keep quiet during the Presidential election?

Communicative version, appropriate if this is an informative text, such as a magazine article:

It may be that this revival of a simple black-and-white concept, and the return to classical Marxism, are intended to make up for the frustration of some members whom the party leader had invited to keep quiet during the Presidential election.

Other commentary on one or another of the sample texts includes explanations of terms, discussion of problems and solutions, translator's intention and methods, suggested alternative translations, and an overall criticism of the version shown. Part II does not provide for the students' own attempts to translate passages but limits itself to furnishing them some grounds for discussion and criticism of the versions presented.

At this point, we may ask to what extent *A Textbook of Translation* lives up to its title and its stated purpose. Newmark argues that the function of a text helps determine the appropriate approach for its translation. For some texts, the translator's greater obligation is to the source, which to a great extent means the form of the source text. In other texts, there may be a greater emphasis on the needs of the readership and hence on the form of the target text. These considerations lead the translator to aim at a "closer" or "freer" rendition. For a similar model presented in far greater detail, see Juliane House's (1977) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. House distinguishes between "overt" and "covert" translations and provides both extensive criteria for text classification and abundant examples of each broad type of translation.

The approach or methodology is to be implemented by "procedures" which apply to grammatically or semantically cohesive segments of the text. These segments constitute units of translation. Here Newmark's text begins to falter by failing to provide students with useful criteria for text segmentation. Even more disappointing is Newmark's scanty treatment of the many procedures listed. Even as fundamental a procedure as transposition or grammatical shift, which merits whole chapters in widely used translation texts like Vinay and Darbelnet (1977) and Vásquez-Ayora (1977), rates but three pages (85-88).

These deficiencies are a natural consequence of a more general shortcoming of *A Textbook of Translation*: an anti-theoretical bias

and a tendency to attack other principled philosophies or schools of translation. We have already noted Newmark's dismissal of both structuralist and generative grammars as irrelevant to translation. Despite the author's limited use of componential analysis and of some concepts of case grammar, the reader's general impression is that there is really no useful theory of translation outside of the advice to watch how skilled practitioners perform. Such a philosophy is unlikely to guide aspiring translators toward greater skill in performance.

If linguistics is mostly irrelevant to translation, so much the more irrelevant are the various approaches to translation and its teaching based on language-related theories or models. Newmark is particularly critical of comparative stylistics as represented by Vinay and Darbelnet (1977), whose *Stylistique comparee du francais et de l'anglais* has for contemporary translation studies the seminal value that Chomsky's (1967) *Syntactic Structures* had for the study of grammar.

The comparative-stylistics model, with its battery of procedures and techniques, remains highly influential despite competition from schools of translation based on text linguistics, discourse analysis, communications theory, and a nascent theory of interpretation. Translation theory exists and now it is in a healthy state of flux. For teachers of translation to turn their backs on what theory or theories have to offer the learner would be a step backwards.

To the extent that translation is a skill, such skill is obviously dependent on extensive practice. To the extent that translation skills can be awakened and channeled to practical use, i.e., if translation can in some sense be taught/learned, systematic guidance is clearly called for. Whether we speak of approaches, principles, models or theories, both beginner and veteran translators cannot but profit from the ever-expanding body of knowledge in their ancient craft, in their modern profession.

The dean of Spanish translators, Royal Academician Valentín García-Yebra (1983), points out that the quality of non-literary translation has far surpassed that of literary translation for various reasons, among them the fruitful interaction between translation studies and linguistics. (*En torno a la traducción*, ch.3, passim). A pedagogically useful treatment of translation would, ideally, should at least, make use of recent theory as a guide to organizing courses of instruction or self-study. Since most of Newmark's examples are drawn from other than literary sources, e.g., from medicine and political science, one would expect the author to make greater use of

the advantages that such texts may have, for translation purposes, over literary uses.

Despite the shortcomings mentioned, *A Textbook of Translation* can be quite helpful as a supplement to other translation textbooks that make extensive use of text linguistics or discourse analysis. One such work is Jean Deslisle's (1980a, 1980b) *L'analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction*, which has been partially translated into English (Deslisle 1988); another is Mildred Larson's (1984) *Meaning-based Translation*. As teaching texts, both of these are far superior to that of Newmark. Deslisle's was written for use in teaching French/English translations, whereas Newmark's book relates to translation between French or German and English. Larson does not focus on any particular language-pairs but rather attempts to vary systematically to provide guidelines for translating between any two languages and their cultures.

Newmark's book has the merit of providing an approach to translation which, if used with discretion should help clarify some of the principles set forth in more elaborate textbooks like those cited above. In terms of empirical techniques for solving specific problems, Newmark assures the sophisticated battery of procedures of the comparative stylisticians. Except for a set of examples, the book is not set up to guide instructors in developing translation exercises. Nevertheless, *A Textbook of Translation* provides a great many valuable hints for the recognition and solution of difficulties that other writers do not always make so explicit. It deserves a role but not a starring one in the bibliography of courses, in principles and procedures of translation.

References

- Deslisle, J. (1980). *L'analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Deslisle, J. (1988). *Translation: An interpretive approach*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- García-Yebra, V. (1983). *En torno a la traducción*. Madrid: Gredos.
- House, J. (1977). *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Krawutschke, P. (ed.) (1989). *Translator and interpreter training and foreign language pedagogy*. Binghamton, NY: SUNY.

- Larson, M. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. Lanham, MA: University Press of America.
- Nida, E. (1975). *Exploring semantic structures*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Seleskovitch, D. & Lederer, M. (1986). *Interpréter pour traduire*. Paris: Didier Erudition.
- Vásquez-Ayora, G. (1977). *Introducción a la traductología*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Vinay, J. & Darbelnet, J. (1977). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Montréal: Beauchemin.

Reviewed by:

FREDERICK G. HENSEY

The Foundations of Dual Language Instruction
Judith Lessow-Hurley. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1990. Textbook

There are now a number of different types of introductory textbooks for dual language instruction, e.g., instruction in a bilingual education setting. Thus, now may be the time to attempt to categorize the texts. One approach may be to view the chapters as conventional, beginning with (1) a historical, political and legal perspective for dual language programs; (2) a rationale for dual language instruction; (3) a framework for second language acquisition; (4) the influence of culture on language acquisition and (5) the research on effective dual language programs.

The first chapter traces both historical and international perspectives. Like other texts this is developed providing information regarding the multilingualism in the world and lack of multilingualism in the United States. The educational language policies and systems of Canada and Sweden are reviewed, especially looking at the their educational policy for school-age immigrant children. These are the countries that have undertaken substantial research in dual language instruction. This is then contrasted with the educational programs provided for this population and other language-minority students in the United States.

The Lessow-Hurley book deviates from a traditional approach of first establishing a research-based rationale for dual language instruction. The second chapter provides a definition of a language model. The four major language programs, i.e., transitional, maintenance, enrichment and immersion are then presented. The author appears to put emphasis on immersion programs by giving particular reference to the Canadian Experience.

The third chapter focuses on aspects of language from a sociolinguistic perspective. A definition of language is provided as well as a descriptive overview of the language system, i.e., phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Language attitudes are addressed since it is the author's belief that language should be objectively viewed from an instructional perspective.

In the fourth chapter, Lessow-Hurley introduces the reader to current language hypotheses which educators are using as a basis for a theoretical framework for dual language instruction. The

factors that effect second language acquisition such as age, personality and social factors are addressed. The acquisition-learning distinction which is an on-going debate among linguists is introduced.

The author turns to language competency, models of language proficiency and the manner in which language is assessed through discrete point and integrative tests in the fifth chapter. The inadequacies of current language assessment instruments are discussed in terms of culture bias which may invalidate language proficiency instruments now being used.

The sixth chapter addresses the issue of bilingualism. A rationale is established for the need for primary language instruction for limited English proficient students. Since student success in the content areas is measured through standardized achievement instruments, the author promotes the need for a language program that stresses the Jim Cummins' Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency theoretical framework. Success students achieve when provided with effective instruction in the native language. The instructional models that may be implemented are provided, such as, the concurrent translation method and the preview-review method.

The seventh chapter is a historical overview of early viewpoints on second language instruction. Various instructional methodologies are described, i.e., the grammar-translation methodology and the audiolingual approach are and more recent innovative approaches. However, he fails to tie the historical aspects to the grammar-translation, audiolingual approach and the modern approaches. The author then presents the Sheltered English approach separate and apart from the other modern approaches now being implemented. The author notes that this approach is more content mastery goal-oriented and more in keeping with Jim Cummins' Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency theoretical framework.

The role of culture and language for academic success for limited English proficient students is addressed in the eighth chapter. The author is in the forefront in focusing on testing within the context of culture. Culture is now considered to be a more important factor in language learning and language instruction.

Chapter nine then reviews culture as a reason given for poor educational performance by language minority students and provides insightful information that should put the culture deficit theory to rest. Several theoretical frameworks to explain differential achievement by the many diverse ethnic groups in the United States are provided.

The final chapter provides a survey of the legal foundations and political influences on dual language instruction. The various state and national court cases and legislative laws that have mandated dual language instruction are reviewed within the context of the United States civil rights movement. This information would have better served the reader in the initial chapters in establishing a rationale for dual language instruction.

The suggestions for further reading are an excellent source for both professors and graduate students.

Reviewed by:
DOLORES CARDENAS

***TPFLE* and the FLSC Journal Committee**

TPFLE, published bi-annually by the FLSC Journal Committee, is devoted to the promotion of pedagogical and theoretical issues relating to Foreign Language Education, Teaching of English as a Foreign/Second Language, and Applied Linguistics related to language learning and teaching.

The FLSC Journal Committee, formed in January 1988, consists of faculty and student members from FLSC. The current members of the committee are listed in the inside front cover of this issue. All students, faculty, and graduates of FLSC are eligible for membership in the committee.

Please address all inquiries to:

TPFLE
Education Building 528
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin TX 78712-1295

Individual copies of this journal are available at \$4.50 each.

Make your checks payable to "The University of Texas at Austin."